

TO SUBSCRIBERS.—*Subscribers desiring to receive their copies post free are requested to forward the amount of their subscription (£2 8s. for the first year, including the WEEKLY REPORTER from the 8th of November last) by Post-office order or otherwise, payable to the Secretary of the Company, Mr. WILLIAM SHAEEN.*

TO NON-SUBSCRIBERS.—*Gentlemen who desire to be supplied with the future numbers of this paper are requested to send their orders to the Office of the Company, 13, Carey-street, Lincoln's Inn, London, W. C.*

* * *It is particularly requested that any error or delay in the transmission of this Journal to Subscribers may be immediately communicated to the Editor.*

ERRATUM.

In our last number, at p. 170, col. 2, line 13 from bottom, after "advanced prices," insert the words "without receiving any check."

THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL.

LONDON, FEBRUARY 21, 1857.

A MINISTER OF JUSTICE.

The reception which Mr. NAPIER's motion, in favour of the appointment of a Minister of Justice, has met with in the House of Commons, renders it pretty evident that the house and the government are at their wit's end on the subject of Law Amendment. After all that has been said and written on the reform of our laws, the revision of the statute book, and the improvement of our methods of legislation, it is still clear enough that our legislators are not very definite in their notions about any of these questions; and that they are still open to accept euphonious nostrums and universal specifics. In such a class we cannot help placing Mr. NAPIER's panacea for all the ills of modern legislation. What the particular functions, or the position of this great new officer of state are to be, no one seems to be able to guess; not even the honourable and learned mover of the question. Some say that he ought to be a lawyer—others that a layman would be more likely to suggest and carry out sweeping reforms. There is also a controversy as to whether he ought to be a peer or a member of the lower house; and, in either case, there is this further question as to his relation to the Lord Chancellor—whether he should be of superior, inferior, or equal dignity.

But suppose all these knotty points to be satisfactorily settled, a still more important consideration remains. What is to be the special province of the department over which it is proposed to place this new minister? Is it intended, as Mr. NAPIER has more than once suggested, that it should be the repository of all the projects of legal reform, which now find their resting place among the archives of Waterloo Place? Or is he merely to content himself with the clerical supervision of such bills as the Lord Chancellor and the law officers of the Crown shall initiate or recommend? Mr. NAPIER vaguely intimates that the department should supply the want which has long been felt of "some central supervision over the administration of public justice," which he says on account of the numerous and pressing engagements of the Lord Chancellor, it is impossible for him to attempt. The main argument, however, adduced in support of the motion, was that some person of rank and authority was required to "mature the measures brought before Parliament," a task which everybody admits is now very imperfectly discharged. Sir RICHARD BETHELL aims at the accomplishment of a grander scheme, by means of existing machinery, without any constitutional change. His programme comprises effectual superintendence over the administration of justice in all its departments; supervision of projects of law amendment; and assistance to the business of current

legislation; but characteristically enough, the ATTORNEY GENERAL's programme contains no reference to the mode in which he proposes to effect these most desirable objects. Lord JOHN RUSSELL's suggestion that the SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR should take upon himself some of the duties now belonging to the Home Department, so as to allow the HOME SECRETARY to assume the functions of a minister of justice, has at all events something tangible and practicable about it, which is more than we can say of the very elaborate dissertation of Sir RICHARD BETHELL.

But let us ask why should the choice lie between the appointment of a new Secretary of State and the constitution of a new department on the one hand; and on the other, the transfer of a considerable portion of the business of the Home Office to other departments, for the purpose of enabling the HOME SECRETARY to do that for which, after all, he would *probably* be wholly incompetent? If in order to carry out this latter plan, it would be necessary not only to charge the War Department with the duty of preserving the public peace, but also to appoint a number of new officials to undertake other duties now discharged by the HOME SECRETARY, why should not the LORD CHANCELLOR, the Constitutional Minister of Justice, and who under any circumstances must control or interfere with any department constituted for the proposed objects, be relieved of his too numerous duties, and thereby be enabled to devote his mind to subjects that are emphatically within his province? By a trifling alteration in the business of the Lords Justices' Court, it would be quite possible for one appellate tribunal to hear and decide all appeals in the Court of Chancery, and the LORD CHANCELLOR would then be enabled to spend the most valuable part of his time—that which intervenes between two sessions of Parliament—in the preparation and revision of new bills. At present, he is just as hard worked as any of the Equity judges, from the end of the long vacation until the opening of Parliament; and it would be, therefore, absurd to expect that he could apply his mind to the close consideration of any comprehensive measures of law amendment which always require the most careful handling and abundant examination. With a suitable departmental staff there is no reason why the Lord Chancellor could not undertake and effect all that the Attorney-General has sketched out; and at the same time discharge his judicial functions, not only in the House of Lords, and at the Privy Council, but also in the Court of Chancery, whenever as sometimes now happens, the importance of a case makes it desirable that it should be heard before his lordship sitting with the Lords Justices.

We think, therefore, that the appointment of a Minister of Justice would not only be an unnecessarily expensive proceeding, but a very inexpedient and inconvenient one; and we suspect that the favour with which some persons have entertained the proposition is not the result of superior information on their part, or of anything else than the notion that as it has been called a measure of administrative reform, it really is so. At the same time, it is to be hoped that, though we need not have a new minister, a new department under the control of the Lord Chancellor may be instituted, and that his lordship, as minister of justice, may be enabled to obtain all the assistance in the preparation of measures intended to be submitted to Parliament, and generally in the administration of public justice, which the public service requires, and which it is impossible for him to receive from the present legal functionaries, however willing they might be to afford it. If such a department should be constituted there might be some official holding a seat in the House of Commons, similar to the under-secretaries of the other departments, which would have the advantage of being at once convenient and constitutional.

Such a plan would certainly be preferable to the

appointment of a new Secretary of State, and would unquestionably be a vast improvement on the present lumbering system of law commissions; which, notwithstanding all the recent eulogies of Lords BROUGHAM and CAMPBELL, no man in our day has done more to bring into disrepute than Mr. BELLENDEN KER, and especially in the late miserable attempt at the consolidation of our Statute Law, in which that learned commissioner has been the presiding genius.

THE LAW OF LIBEL.

The course taken by the *Times* in relation to the case of *Davison v. Duncan* is remarkable in more ways than one. That a newspaper should impugn a decision of the Court of Queen's Bench as bad law; that the Lord Chief Justice should make a speech in the House of Lords which looked very like an apology to the newspaper for the conclusion at which the Court arrived; that the newspaper should then, after repeating its charge of timidity, if not of ignorance, repay the judge's complaisance in a strain of patronising compliment not unlike insult,—are facts which deserve to be remembered as an illustration of the character of several of our institutions.

We fully agree with the *Times* in thinking that Lord CAMPBELL is not only a great judge, but a very remarkable man; but the value of its evidence upon the subject is somewhat diminished by the naïve insolence which prompted the writer of the article in question to say of a class which contains such men as the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, Mr. Justice CRESSWELL, and Mr. Justice ERLE—"Some of them may be good pleaders, and all are honest, painstaking judges." The courage of the learned person who looks down upon the bench with such ineffable condescension is materially enhanced by the circumstance that his view of the law is entirely wrong. The proposition which he maintains is, that it would have been competent to the Court of Queen's Bench to hold in the case of *Davison v. Duncan*, that if A. speaks words of B. which do not expose him to an action for defamation, C. may assert in print that he used them, without exposing himself to an action for libel. He supports this proposition by an argument which misquotes or misunderstands every case to which it refers.

"In the twelfth part of Lord COKE's reports," we are told, "we find the celebrated case of the Earl of Northampton." We also find the following note prefixed to the part in question. "The twelfth reports are said by Mr. HARGRAVE to be of small authority, being not only posthumous, but apparently nothing more than a collection from papers neither digested nor intended for the press by the author. Serjeant HILL refers to fo. 18, 19, as showing that the twelfth report is not fit to be allowed." "It (Lord NORTHAMPTON's case) was decided," says the *Times*, "so long ago as 1612, and the resolution was made after solemn argument by eleven out of the twelve judges of England. The resolution was in these words—'In a private action for slander of a common person, if J. S. publish that he hath heard J. N. say that J. G. was a traitor or thief, in an action on the case, he may justify, &c.'" The resolution was not made after solemn argument. The defendants pleaded guilty, and the resolutions of the judges were entirely extra-judicial; the particular resolution quoted by the *Times* was quite foreign to the matter in hand, for the proceeding in question was on a criminal information for a *scandalum magnatum*. "This," says the *Times*, "was the old common law, and the judges who announced it quoted abundant decisions of their and of Lord CAMPBELL's predecessors." It was a judgment of the Court of Star Chamber—the most unconstitutional and tyrannical court that ever existed in England—a court of which the specific peculiarity was its enmity to the common law, and so far from

having quoted "abundant decisions," the judges in Lord NORTHAMPTON's case quoted but two decisions from the year-books, one of which seems to us curiously irrelevant to the subject-matter. "A smatterer in law," continues Lord CAMPBELL's patron, "will object that this resolution was of words spoken and not of words written. Lord CAMPBELL is too good a lawyer to make such a reply. He knows that it is most indubitable that when this judgment was given, the courts recognised no distinction between oral and written slander. It was so recently as the year 1812 that the distinction between written and spoken defamation was first formally drawn." It is quite true that in Lord NORTHAMPTON's case no distinction was drawn between libel and defamation, and, indeed, such a distinction would have been even more foreign to the case before the court than the resolutions which were actually made; but when the case of *Thorley v. Lord Kerry*, which formally established the distinction, was decided in 1812, the judgment was expressly based upon the fact, that for more than a century past the courts had acted upon the rule that words might be libellous for which an action of defamation would not lie. No doubt Sir JAMES MANSFIELD said upon that occasion, "I cannot upon principle make any difference between words written and words spoken as to the right which arises on them of bringing an action:" and this the *Times* quotes; but he also went on to say that the practice was so well settled that he could not disturb it, and this the *Times* does not quote.

After a reference to *McGregor v. Thwaites*, which is only slightly unfair, the writer in the *Times* goes on to the case of *De Crespigny v. Wellesley*; but, before noticing it, he uses an expression which is not a little remarkable:—"We admit that from time to time the judges cast an evil eye upon the old law." Was the writer haunted by the recollection of a case of *Lewis v. Walter* (4 B. & Ald. 614), which formed an authority almost expressly in point in *De Crespigny v. Wellesley*, and in which the proprietor of the *Times* was the defendant, and a Hampshire attorney the plaintiff? "No court," says the *Times*, "thought itself strong enough to repeal so solemn a decision" (as Lord NORTHAMPTON's case) "till"—the case of *De Crespigny v. Wellesley*. We answer that *Lewis v. Walter* went quite as far as *De Crespigny v. Wellesley*. Mr. Justice HOLROYD said on that occasion, "The book in which Lord NORTHAMPTON's case is found, is not so accurate as the rest of the reports of Lord COKE. The point there is stated in very general terms, and, as it seems to me, may be questionable."—"In the case of *De Crespigny v. Wellesley*," the *Times* says, "Chief Justice BEST stepped out of his way, and confessedly without any necessity for the purpose of the case before the court," overruled the rule for which the *Times* contends. Chief Justice BEST did no such thing. He decided the case on a broad principle which directly applied to it, instead of disposing of it as he might have done by a side-wind.

We have shown how the writer in the *Times* misunderstands and misrepresents his authorities; but his logic is even more at fault than his learning. He argues thus:—"There are some things which it is actionable to say, and there may be a doubt whether, before the year 1812, it was actionable to write any other things, though, since that time, the distinction between libel and verbal slander has been established beyond all doubt whatever. Lord NORTHAMPTON's case decided that it was not actionable to repeat what it was actionable to say, if the repeater vouched the original author; therefore, since 1812, it cannot be actionable to state in writing that a person used words which, when spoken, were not actionable. Surely, this is a wonderful consequence. The true inference would be, that as before 1812 it was not actionable to repeat in words what it was actionable to originate in words; so after

In the trial
the trier
Excheq
"Mr.
the attor
brought
and mys
"Mr.
any such
do so."
"Mr.
attorney
"Mr.
We h
is a cor
BRAMW
the plain
fairly tri
pected,
the attac
We have
actual w
treated
penalty
substant
and grea
by the d
attorney
prehend
haying do

1812 it would not be actionable to repeat in writing what it was actionable to originate in writing. The reason of the rule in both cases being that the person slandered is enabled by the person repeating the slander to bring an action against the original slanderer; but this reason does not apply in cases where the printing is the gist of the offence, because by printing what is libellous, though not (technically) defamatory, the printer injures the person attacked, and gives him no remedy against the person attacking him. Very shortly, the argument of the *Times* is this:—"The law of defamation is too lax, therefore relax the law of libel. You may call a man an adulterer, a liar, and a rogue with impunity, therefore you ought not to punish us for giving additional currency to his slanders." In our humble opinion it is wiser to increase the risk of defamation than to diminish the risk of libel, and we cannot express our reasons for that opinion in better words than those which were used by the "Old Tory judge, whose politics no one respects, and whose learning no lawyer venerates," as the *Times* calls one of the ablest men that ever sat on the bench. In his judgment on the case of *De Crespigny v. Wellesley*, Lord WYNFORD said:—

"If the person receiving a libel may publish it at all, he may publish it in whatever manner he pleases—he may insert it in all the journals, and thus circulate his calumny through every region of the globe. The effect of this is very different from that of the repetition of oral slander. In the latter case, what has been said is known only to a few persons; and if the statement is untrue, the imputation cast upon any one may be got rid of; the report is not heard of beyond the circle in which all the parties move, and the veracity of the accuser, and the previous character of the accused, will be properly estimated. But if the report is to be spread over the world by means of the press, the malignant falsehood of the vilest of mankind, which would not receive the least credit when the author is known, would make an impression which it would require much time and trouble to erase, and which it might be difficult, if not impossible, ever completely to remove."

Legal News.

In the *Daily News* of the 24th ult., in the report of the trial of an action (*Disborough v. Midgley*) in the Exchequer, the following passage occurs:—

"Mr. Serjeant Thomas—As an imputation has been cast on the attorney in this case, may I observe that this action was brought by the advice of my learned friend, Mr. Charnock, and myself.

"Mr. Baron Bramwell—You are not justified in making any such statement; it is not, as counsel, your province to do so.

"Mr. Serjeant Thomas excused himself, by saying that the attorney for the plaintiff had been attacked.

"Mr. Baron Bramwell—Let the attorney submit to it then."

We believe, from inquiries we have made, that this is a correct report of the words used by Mr. Baron BRAMWELL, and we think it our duty to point out that the plaintiff's attorney in the case was harshly and unfairly treated, and that he ought not to have been expected, by the learned Baron, to "submit" to the attack made upon him by the defendant's counsel. We have been informed that the case was really one of actual wrong to the plaintiff, that the defendant had treated her very shamefully, and well deserved the penalty inflicted on him by the verdict. There was substantially no defence, and a very skilful advocate and great master of vituperative rhetoric was reduced, by the dearth of other topics, to heap abuse on the attorney who had brought the action. Now, we apprehend that Baron BRAMWELL was quite correct in laying down that the plaintiff's counsel over-stepped his

province when he stated that the action was brought under his advice. It is the duty of the attorney to decide whether a particular action can fairly and properly be brought, and if he takes proceedings for the sake of vexation or unjust extortion, he cannot be allowed to shelter himself under the authority of counsel when charged with prostituting to unworthy purposes the process of the Court. It is not, however, very surprising that the plaintiff's counsel should have been anxious to defend the attorney from an imputation which appears to have been undeserved. These attacks are hardly ever made in cases where counsel on the other side have a legitimate opportunity of answering them in the course of the reply. When the defendant's counsel offers no evidence, his speech immediately precedes the judge's summing up, and thus no opportunity is afforded either for the plaintiff's attorney, or for counsel on his behalf, to vindicate his injured character. But to us it appears that this vicious practice ought not to be suffered to continue. If counsel be willing to defend the attorney's reputation, he might surely be allowed to do so, even though he should thereby step beyond the strict line of his peculiar duty. And if the attorney desires personally to vindicate himself, it does seem most unfair to deny him a few moments' hearing for that purpose. It may be quite true that this is after all a matter of no great consequence, for the device of abusing the attorney who has presented an unanswerable case is so familiar, that even a common jury are not likely to be influenced by such means. At the same time, it deserves attention that such attacks are frequently made, and usually left unanswered. Nobody thinks it worth while to waste one word or one moment's time in removing imputations which we nevertheless fear must, by their frequent repetition, exercise a certain influence upon the estimate popularly formed of the attorneys. An upright man, with his hands full of business, will, probably, not bestow a thought upon an attack which he knows cannot do him the least injury with any one whose opinion he regards. But we think that an attorney thus unfairly and unnecessarily assailed owes to the profession generally the duty of at least offering to vindicate his own character; and we think, also, that the presiding judge would do well to allow a brief hearing to such a vindication, even although the proceeding were not strictly regular. Such an interruption would be quite as seasonable as the jokes of some judges, and the platitudes of others. We would, further, venture to suggest that some check might properly be placed on the exuberance of injurious epithets with which the conduct of the plaintiff's attorney is sometimes assailed by counsel. We observe that lately the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas interfered to protect a witness against the violence which is too commonly resorted to by accomplished brow-beaters. This admonition, if repeated a few times, would put down a very unseemly practice, and we think that the attorney, as well as the witness, deserves rather more protection from the court than hitherto he has usually enjoyed.

In a letter in the *Daily News* of the 18th inst., on the subject of "County Courts," we find the following sensible remarks on the identity of professional interests, rightly understood, with those of the community:

"For myself, I confess, that if, by the plan I propose, the interests of the legal profession were likely to be sacrificed, I should pause long before I adopted it.

"The moral and intellectual standard of either the legal adviser or the advocate, can never, in such a state of society as ours, be lowered without inflicting serious injury upon the community at large.

"But will the legal profession be prejudiced by the plan proposed? I think the contrary may be shown.

"Have the devotees of Westminster-hall ever reflected upon

the vast amount of business now lost to the legal profession, simply because the would-be litigants are deterred from the contest by the delay and the expense which necessarily attend on it? In how many cases is a compromise effected, not because either party is satisfied with it, but because the evils avoided by it are still more intolerable?

"How many just claims are abandoned, because their abandonment is preferable to their prosecution?"

"One tenth part of the inconvenience, expense, and delay attendant upon the instance I have given will deter, and ought to deter, a prudent man from seeking to enforce his rights, or complain of his wrongs; and the members of the legal profession may feel well assured that as long as you compel the would-be plaintiff to have recourse to a distant and necessarily expensive tribunal, you largely diminish the general legal business of the country, and prejudice professional interests, while you are unjust to the suitor."

"But by the reform proposed, if reform it be, Westminster will not be benefited."

"I utterly deny it. The county courts will become, if you permit them, tribunals for the determination of disputed facts—and, where the law is not doubtful, for the decision of points of law. They will be resorted to only when more convenient than the superior courts. When legal difficulties are involved, they will be argued by appeal in Westminster-hall, before the superior judges, and by the ablest advocates. I apply myself with confidence to any lawyer, and ask, whether the cases (of comparatively small importance in mere amount) which have hitherto been sent up from the county courts have not been among the most interesting of purely legal inquiries, and the most suitable for argument and decision in Westminster?"

"Enlarge, then, the amount of legal business throughout the country, and (reserving the right of appeal on points of law) I doubt not you will increase, instead of diminishing, the practice of Westminster. It is true, that general business will be somewhat differently distributed. It cannot, in any case, be otherwise. New seats of manufactures and commerce have arisen to compete with the capital, even in political importance. In more than one district of Lancashire alone there is a population far exceeding that of London proper. If, by such a state of things, local advocates are created, they cannot be denied admittance to the arena. But, in truth, they must fight at a disadvantage. The metropolis will always command the ablest speakers and the most trained lawyers, for it will reward them most liberally. Do away with the prejudices attending practice in the county court—enlarge its jurisdiction—let the stakes be large, if the litigants desire it, and the contests will be ably conducted."

"Nor in this age of railways is it difficult to obtain in any part of England the services of some of the most able London advocates. Above all, secure by a well-digested system of appeal a final recourse to Westminster, and the legal profession will have no cause in any branch of it to fear a diminution of business."

"I have been writing above of class interests; but those interests are too powerful to be prudently neglected."

"Firmly believing that they can never, in the long run, be different from those of the community, I am yet anxious to conciliate support where I should dread hostility. On the meanest pecuniary calculation, I believe the scheme proposed by me will benefit Westminster-hall. Sure I am that those who love (as I do) even its traditions, and desire to uphold its dignity, should support an effort to secure its popularity by extending its usefulness."

JUSTICE TO THE LORD CHANCELLOR.—The *Times* used to be as remarkable for the correctness of its information as for the ability with which such information was turned to account in its leading articles. But however it may retain its character for cleverness, it certainly is in a fair way of losing its reputation for accuracy. The two recent attacks upon the Lord Chancellor and the Court of Chancery are full of blunders and misrepresentations, which our duty to the profession and to society compels us to expose. "Six years ago," says the *Times* in its leader of Saturday last, "we appointed two additional judges to do what our Lord Chancellor had heretofore (*sic*) done single-handed. The aids have been so vigorous that Lord Cranworth opens a seven weeks' sitting with a list of three appeals. In Chancery he has comparatively nothing to do." Now every one of these allegations is the reverse of the truth. It is not true that the Lords Justices were appointed to do, together with the Lord Chancellor, what had previously been

done by Lord Chancellors single-handed. On the contrary, the number of appeals now bears a greater proportion to the number of appellate judges than in the days of Lord Eldon; and so far from its being the fact, that Lord Cranworth had only three appeals in a seven weeks' sitting, and that "so far as his judicial duties are concerned, he is almost as otiose a gentleman as his brother of Lancaster"; the truth is, that from the first day of Michaelmas term last until the opening of Parliament, the Lord Chancellor sat every day that the other equity judges sat, with scarcely any, if one single exception. He frequently sat until after dusk, and on several occasions by candle-light. On the 2nd January, in the short Christmas vacation, he sat with Lord Justice Turner until past seven o'clock in the evening to hear the appeal from the decision of Commissioner Holroyd in *Re The Royal British Bank Ex parte Shore*. Instead of only hearing three appeals during the period to which we allude, he heard thirty-three, and pronounced judgment in thirty-one, many of them causes of great complexity and importance. In this number we do not include patent cases, or other applications which came before the Lord Chancellor directly, nor yet any of those interlocutory applications which are constantly referred to his lordship by the judges of the courts below, when there is any doubt as to the practice or procedure of the Court. It is, moreover, the well-known practice of Lord Cranworth to take home with him all the papers in every heavy case where the evidence is voluminous, and therefore requires patient investigation; and in such cases as the *Mayor of Berwick v. Murray*, and *Broadbent v. The Imperial Gas Light Company*, the only wonder has been how he managed in so short a space of time to master the quantity of evidence with which each case was overlaid. During the sitting of Parliament, the Lord Chancellor, as a rule—almost without an exception—sits in the Court of Chancery every day that he is not engaged judicially in hearing appeals in the House of Lords, or, as he has been recently been, in the Privy Council. The statement of the *Times*, therefore, that after the long vacation he had but three appeals to hear, and, in point of fact, that he has had nothing to do, and does nothing, is as untrue as any statement can possibly be; we venture to affirm, on the contrary, that, since last November, Lord Cranworth has had more to do, and has gone through more intellectual labour than many professional men in England, including barristers of large practice.

Another instance of the gross ignorance of the *Times* as to the facts of the case, on which it so flippantly pronounces judgment, is its description of the process of appeal in the Court of Chancery. It speaks of "the frequent appeals from a Vice-Chancellor to the Lords Justices, from the Lords Justices to the Lord Chancellor, and from the Lord Chancellor to the House of Lords." Now, every tyro of a month's standing in a solicitor's office knows that there is no such thing known, or possible, as an appeal from the Lords Justices to the Lord Chancellor, but that the two courts have generally co-ordinate jurisdiction, and that it is a mere matter of arrangement as to whether the Lords Justices or Lord Chancellor shall, during any particular sitting, take the appeals from the Master of the Rolls or any given Vice-Chancellor. For example, sometimes the Lord Chancellor in Trinity Term, will perhaps take all appeals from Vice-Chancellor Stuart, and the Lords Justices all from Vice-Chancellor Kindersley, and *vice versa* in Michaelmas Term. But it has been reserved for the *Times* to discover a step in Chancery procedure, which has altogether escaped the observation of the Legislature, the judges, and the legal profession. We certainly now learn, for the first time, that it is possible to appeal to the Chancellor from a decision of the Lords Justices. Another specimen of the ignorance, or intentional unfairness, with which these attacks are conducted, is to be found in the contrast which is made between the judicial labours of Lord Cranworth and such judges as Lord Eldon, &c. "A superstition still survives in England," says the writer, "that a Chancellor is an unhappy State drudge, who vainly toils to keep down a hopelessly accumulating amount of work; that he is like a prisoner condemned to the Spanish pump, when the volume of water running into his cell is rather greater than the highest pitch of muscular exertion can pump out. This is a history of other days—of the days of Eldon, Brougham, and Lyndhurst." The argument is, that Lord Eldon and other chancellors in former days were able to manage without the assistance of Lords Justices, and so ought Lord Cranworth; or, at all events, that one court of appeal should be quite sufficient now as it formerly was, and that, the Lords Justices being appellate judges, the Lord Chancellor has abundance of time on his hands for law reform. But the writer of the paragraph, which we have quoted, must be ignorant of what nine out of every ten ordinary persons of

education are acquainted with, viz:—that in Lord Eldon's time there was only one inferior judge in the Court of Chancery—the Master of the Rolls; and that, therefore, the Lord Chancellor had to hear appeals from only one court, while there are now, in addition to the Master of the Rolls, three Vice-Chancellors; so that *ceteris paribus*, the number of appeals is four-fold what it was in those days. We have no reliable statistics before us, but we have little hesitation in saying that there are now actually ten times as many causes, or matters which formerly would have been causes, heard and decided in the Court of Chancery, as there were in Lord Eldon's time. But even admitting that there has been no greater increase in the business than bears a proportion to the increased number of judges, and assuming the ratio of appeals to remain stationary, yet the increase would be as four to one; and, therefore, the argument of the *Times* proceeds upon an assumption that is wholly and obviously false.

It is also worthy of notice that another marked difference between the state of appeal business at present and in days of yore, is that formerly the list of appeals to be heard was always of great extent, simply because the Lord Chancellor was generally two or three years in arrear, while now the judgment of a court of appeal is commonly pronounced within as many months—and in the case of motions, within as many weeks—after the decision of the court below. Any person who is acquainted with the actual practice of the courts must admit this to be the fact; and a very little consideration will show that where the appellate courts properly discharge the functions and answer the ends of such tribunals, they will usually be able to hear appeals within a reasonable time after they have been brought—while the facts and the arguments are still fresh in the minds of counsel and solicitors, and before new complications arise in the relations of parties to the suit, or by reason of a change in the parties themselves. A very long list of unheard appeals, therefore, is merely a proof of the inadequacy of the appellate tribunals, or the incompetency of their judges. It is certainly a novel charge against the Lord Chancellor that there are now no arrears of judicial business, the actual amount of business being notoriously much larger than it ever yet has been; but thus it is that accusations which spring from ignorance or malevolence sometimes turn out to be the highest tribute of praise.

So long as the leading articles of the *Times* on legal questions continue to be characterised by an almost incredible amount of ignorance and recklessness of assertion, so long will its random-shot thunderbolts fail to injure anything but the *Times* itself. If it really desires to aid in the work of law amendment, it would be certainly well worth its while to gain some little information on the subjects necessary to be discussed.

NEW MASTER OF THE QUEEN'S BENCH.—Lord Campbell stated in court on Feb. 14th, that ten days since a certificate had been laid on the table of the House of Commons, in which the judges of the Court of Queen's Bench certified that it was essentially necessary for the administration of justice that a fifth Master for the court should be appointed. His lordship then said that he had appointed Mr. Henry John Hodgson, of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, to be the new Master, in the room of the late Master, Mr. Richard Goodrich.

LAW COURTS COMMISSION.—Baron Martin has been added to the Royal Commission for inquiry into the statute and common law courts and the courts of assize, in the room of Baron Alderson, deceased.

VACANCIES AND APPOINTMENTS.—The office of chief clerk of Marylebone Police Court has become vacant by the death of Mr. James Fell.—Mr. C. S. Whitmore, of the Oxford Circuit, has been appointed Judge of the Southwark County Court, in the room of Mr. George Clive, now M.P. for Hereford, who resigned his judgeship before addressing the electors of that city.—Mr. Martley, an eminent barrister, is appointed Chief Commissioner of the Incumbered Estates Court, Ireland, at a salary of £3,000 a-year.

ROYAL BRITISH BANK.—On the 18th inst., counsel applied, by permission, on behalf of Mr. Marcus, for leave to appeal to the House of Lords against the decision of the Lords Justices pronounced on the 19th of December last, whereby they had refused to annul the adjudication in bankruptcy which had been pronounced against the bank. The ground of the application was, that the questions of construction involved in the case as presented to their lordships, were of sufficient difficulty, and considering the magnitude of the interests affected by them, of sufficient importance to warrant the court in giving such leave, according to the power in that behalf given to them in the 18th section of the Bankrupt Law

Consolidation Act. It was objected, that after so long a delay, and the important steps which had been taken under the order already pronounced, that order of the court ought not to be appealed from. Their lordships refused the application, being of opinion, that, though if applied for at once or very shortly after the order was pronounced, the leave required would unquestionably have been granted, it ought not, under all the circumstances of the case, to be given after so long a delay; it appearing that Mr. Marcus had given no intimation to any of his opponents of his intention to apply to the court before the 14th instant.

On the 19th instant, there was a meeting for the last examination of the directors of the bank. Mr. Linklater, for the assignees, recommended an adjournment for two months; and added—We are in hopes that before then matters will have so far progressed that we may be able to announce the fact that shareholders are no longer in peril from proceedings of individual creditors. The assignees are desirous of impressing upon creditors the great importance of withholding proceedings against individual shareholders, in order that the general arrangement for compromise may not be frustrated, by depriving us of the funds that would otherwise be subscribed by those shareholders who are willing to do their duty to the general body, but who, in the event of individual proceedings against them, may be driven out of the country or forced to seek protection from this court. The shareholders have now come to the unanimous resolution to raise a sufficient fund for the payment of a composition which is admitted on all hands to be reasonable and fair. We hope that in a very few days the creditors will be called together in order that they may come to such unanimous resolution as will enable the shareholders to carry out this arrangement. It is only upon occasions of this kind that the assignees have the opportunity of expressing to the public how exceedingly important it is that there should be an end of individual process, which can but have the effect of exhausting means that ought to be applicable to the payment of the debts.—Mr. Lawrence: Shareholders should now use their best exertions to carry out the compromise to which the assignees and committee of depositors, as far as they can in their corporate character, and almost without exception in their individual capacity as creditors, have given their consent and are willing to give their co-operation. The proceedings taken by individual creditors against shareholders have had the effect of sending from the country many of those from whom the largest amount of contribution was expected. The creditors as a body have been most considerate and forbearing, and the aggravated and vexatious nature of such actions as have been commenced, arises from the multiplicity of the notices to recover the same debt. In one case, where the debt was originally £46, the creditor, a woman, proved that debt under the bankruptcy and received the dividend of 5s. 6d. in the pound, thereby reducing the balance to about £30. An action was brought against the official manager, and judgment was obtained against him. Executions were levied in three different counties for the purpose of obtaining a return of *nulla bona*, and no less than nine notices were served on nine different shareholders in respect of that wretched fragment of a debt. The costs thereby incurred amounted to at least thrice the sum sought to be recovered, or rather the sum due, for it would be erroneous to say that the attorney was seeking to recover payment of the debt. I wish to impress upon the shareholders for their own sakes the absolute necessity of discarding all personal considerations, and at once assisting the assignees in carrying out a compromise to which they have already given their cordial and ready assent. Creditors, even the most forbearing and most considerate, cannot be expected to abstain from proceeding for an indefinite period, and unless the shareholders will exert themselves to raise a sufficient fund, it is clear that such cases as that I have already mentioned will not be exceptions.

CROSSED CHEQUES.—In the case of *Simmonds v. Taylor*, in the Common Pleas this week, the question raised by the action (involving the construction to be put on the recent act relating to drafts on bankers, 19 & 20 Vict. c. 25) was one of great importance to bankers and the public, and was, whether where a customer of a bank crosses a cheque, but before presentment the crossing has been fraudulently obliterated by some person, through whom it is presented at the bank, and it is paid over the counter in the ordinary course of business, the loss falls upon the bank or upon the customer.

The CHIEF JUSTICE said the question was, whether the words of the act which made it obligatory upon a banker to pay a crossed cheque only through a banker had reference to the

time of the drawing of the cheque, or the time of the presentment at the bank. That question he would reserve for the opinion of the Court. On the question of negligence he said that it was a daily occurrence to send cheques and drafts through the post, and the business of the country could not go on unless that was done. Then the jury must say whether every cheque presented at a banker's was to be scrutinised by holding it up to the light to see if it was crossed, as had been suggested. They were to say whether the bank had exercised due and reasonable care in paying this cheque, there being nothing at once visible to the eye on the face of it at the time when it was presented, to show that it had been crossed. The jury found that there was no negligence on either the part of the plaintiff or of the defendant, and a verdict was then entered for the defendant, subject to leave to the plaintiff to move on the point reserved.

Recent Decisions in Chancery.

There are several cases in the books of gifts by will for the benefit of the testator's creditors, where they had previously compromised their legal claims, or where the debts were barred by the statute of limitations. In *Coppin v. Coppin*, 2 P. Wms. 291, the testator, who had compounded with his creditors for 10s. in the pound, by his will gave the residue of his estate to a trustee upon trust to pay to the testator's creditors, who had so compounded, the balance without interest. Upon the construction of this bequest, it was held that the compounding creditors, having released their debts, could only claim as voluntary legatees, and had no other title than to legacies in such manner as given by the will. In *Williamson v. Naylor*, 3 Y. & C. Exch. 208, the testator had been a member of a partnership which had compounded with its creditors, and he by his will declared that one-fifth of the residue of his personal estate should be divided among such of the creditors of the partnership "as were contained in a schedule (annexed to the will) according to the amount of such creditors' debts, the other creditors of the said concern having been already satisfied" by the testator. The schedule contained the names of the individuals and the firms to which the partnership was indebted, the amount of each debt being set opposite the respective names. The case was further distinguishable from *Coppin v. Coppin* by the fact, that there the creditors had released their debts, while here they had not done so. Lord Lyndhurst, sitting in the Exchequer, at the hearing of the cause, was of opinion that this gift was not to be taken as mere voluntary bounty on the part of the testator, but that he meant the money to be applied in satisfaction, or part satisfaction, of those debts, which, though they could not be enforced against him, were still subsisting debts. The creditors, therefore, his lordship held to be entitled strictly as creditors, and not as legatees; and, consequently, there was no lapse of the interest of those who died in the testator's lifetime. When the cause subsequently came on upon further directions, it was argued for the next of kin, that the whole of the creditors' claims depended upon the particular clause in the will, and not on a general revival by the testator of his debts, which were, therefore, not payable out of his general assets. It was not necessary to decide this point; but Baron Alderson, who heard the cause in the Exchequer, coincided with Lord Lyndhurst's view, that it was a devise to pay such persons as should reasonably appear to be the creditors of the partnership at the testator's death. "There are," said his lordship (3 Y. & C. Exch. 215), "a variety of debts mentioned in the schedule as being due to firms, and to the executors of different persons. Obviously, therefore, the schedule refers not to individuals, but debts; it points to the debts, rather than to the persons of the creditors." Both these cases have been discussed very fully in *Philips v. Philips*, 3 Hare, 281, which was almost identical with *Williamson v. Naylor*, except that the gift included the respective executors and administrators of the creditors. Payment was to be made unto and amongst the several persons who were the testator's creditors at the time he executed a conveyance of his estate and effects for their general benefit, their respective executors and administrators, such payment to be made amongst such persons respectively, their respective executors or administrators, rateably and in proportion to the quantum or amount of the original debt or debts due at the date of the conveyance. Vice-Chancellor Wigram held that the representatives of creditors who died in the lifetime of the testator were entitled to claim, the testator's object being to discharge *pro tanto* his obligations to his creditors, notwithstanding the bar of the statute. The same question substantially

was raised in *Turner v. Martin*, 5 W. R. 277, where a person had been a member of a partnership which was bankrupt in 1822, and by his will he directed his just debts to be paid, including the unpaid-in-full debts proved on the estate of the bankrupt firm. The executors admitted assets sufficient to pay the amount found due. The Lord Chancellor held that the shares of those creditors who died before the testator did not lapse, but that they were payable to their representatives. It was further held, upon the principle of *Foster v. Ley*, 2 Bli. N. C. 259, that, the debts having been barred by the statute of limitations, legacy duty was payable. In such cases as those to which we have been referring, it is generally very difficult to say either that the testator meant simple bounty, or that he intended merely to discharge an obligation. Perhaps the fund should be regarded—as it has been no doubt in some of the cases—as characterised by the mixed motives of the testator, in fixing it with the payment of debts which have been barred or released. In one sense, such a gift must be regarded as bounty, in another as being only the due of its objects.

In *Wolley v. Jenkins*, 5 W. R. 281, a very difficult question, and one highly interesting to conveyancers, was discussed at length. Upon a marriage settlement an estate was settled to the use of Mr. J. A. Gordon for life; remainder to the use of Mrs. Gordon, if she survived her husband, to secure a jointure; remainder to the use of other trustees for £500 to raise the arrears of the jointure. There was then a limitation to the original trustees for 2,000 years upon trusts to raise portions for younger children, and subject to the said estates for life and to the said terms, the estate was limited in favour of the issue of the marriage, with an ultimate remainder to Mr. Gordon, the husband, in fee. The settlement also contained a power to the widow at any time after his decease, by deed or will, to charge £2,000 upon the settled property to be raised after her decease, for the benefit of her own estate, and for that purpose to create a term; and there was also a power to the original trustees during the life of Mr. Gordon, with his consent, and within twenty-one years after his decease with the consent of the persons for the time being entitled to the receipts of the annual rents and profits, to sell or exchange the hereditaments. There was no issue, and Mr. Gordon died, having devised the estate, subject to the subsisting interests of his widow, to trustees upon trust for sale. The question for the court was, whether the trustees of the settlement, or the trustees of the will, were the proper parties to sell. After the very elaborate arguments of counsel, which are epitomised in the report, the Lord Chancellor affirmed the decision of the Master of the Rolls, by which his Honour held that the power to the trustees of the settlement had gone. "On the whole," said the Master of the Rolls, "my opinion is, that the power in the settlement cannot be exercised after the union of the estate for life with the reversion or remainder in fee; that this union, in the present case, took place upon the death of the husband; and that the trustees of the settlement, therefore, ceased to have any right to exercise the power originally vested in them."

In *Borradaile v. Smart*, 5 W. R. 271, Vice-Chancellor Wood held that a lessor is not entitled, in the absence of any stipulation to that effect, to insist upon witnessing, by himself or his agent, the execution, by the lessee, of the counterpart of the lease. His Honour, however, appeared to be of opinion that where a practice of that kind existed, as (it was stated) in the case of the Duke of Bedford's estate in London, it might be an implied stipulation.

The first of a flight of cases shortly to be expected upon the complicated provisions of the Succession Duty Act, was decided lately by the Master of the Rolls. Like most modern statutes, the act contains elaborate definitions of the terms employed, and attempts to define, with extreme precision, the persons who shall be considered as predecessors and successors respectively, for the purpose of fixing the rate of duty to be paid. Either intentionally, or otherwise, the language used is such as to admit of the same person being his own predecessor, and, consequently, also successor to himself. For such a case no scale of duty is provided, and one of the points argued in the case of *Re Jenkinson* 5 W. R. 301, was that Sir Charles Jenkinson filled this double character, and that the duty was, therefore, not payable. The facts of the case were shortly these:—Sir Charles Jenkinson, a tenant for life, agreed to pay an annuity to Sir George Jenkinson, who had the remainder in tail, in return for which Sir George charged the remainder with £5,000, to be at the disposal of Sir Charles, and £20,000 to be held on trust for the daughters of Sir Charles. The first question was, whether any duty was payable on the £5,000, which was decided in the negative, on the ground that it was a purchase for money or

money's worth, and, therefore, within the exemption of the 17th section. The other and more knotty point was, who was to be treated as the predecessor of the daughters—their father who had paid the annuity to secure the provision for them, or the relative who had charged it on the family estate. The Master of the Rolls regarded the transaction as a purchase by the tenant for life, and held him to be the grantor, and, as a necessary consequence, the minimum duty of £1 per cent. only was payable.

A case of considerable interest to all who live within the metropolitan district has also been decided by the Master of the Rolls, with respect to the powers of the Board of Works. The plaintiffs in *Stainton v. Metropolitan Board of Works*, 5 W. R. 305, were the executors of a gentleman who had spent a vast amount of money in turning a small brook into fish ponds and ornamental waters about his grounds. The Metropolitan Board built a sewer, and tapped the source of the stream which had supplied the pond. The plaintiffs contended, and perhaps proved, that if the sewer had been made water-tight, the ornamental water would not have suffered. The Board of Works maintained that the sewer was a good sewer for drainage purposes, well constructed, and that it fulfilled its purpose all the better for admitting the percolation of the surface and other water. It did not appear that any further inconvenience could arise from caulking the crevices of the sewer where it passed near the plaintiffs' pond than some additional expense; but it was shown that it would be absolutely impossible to adopt the watertight system generally, as the water that leaked through was essential to maintain the flow of the sewer. The question, therefore, resolved itself into this—whether the board could be compelled in a particular case to adopt an exceptional mode of construction for the convenience of the plaintiffs, or whether they were not left to the compensation which was provided for injury under the act in much the same terms as in the Land Clauses Act. A very near approach to a precedent in favour of the plaintiffs was supplied by the case of *Coats v. The Clarence Railway Company*, before Lord Lyndhurst, which is reported in 1 Russ. & My. 181. The only difference in principle was, that the bridge in that case was not, like the sewer in this, shown to be properly constructed so far as the purposes of the act were concerned. Upon this distinction the Master of the Rolls founded his judgment, and refused to grant a mandatory injunction to compel the board to adopt an extraordinary mode of construction, solely for the benefit of the plaintiffs.

Holloway v. Radcliffe, 5 W. R. 271, deserves a passing notice for the dictum which it contains, to the effect that one of a number of joint legatees of the proceeds of the sale of land cannot, without the concurrence of the rest, elect to take his undivided share as realty. The inconvenience of conflicting elections would be very great if they were to prevent a sale, though no such consideration would arise on the question whether the proceeds should go to the heir or personal representative of the electing legatee. The judgment in the present case, partly founded on the disability of the legatee to elect, and partly on the question of fact as to the election, was in favour of the personal representative.

Stanley v. Jackman, 5 W. R. 302, supplies the judicial interpretation of a direction to trustees to settle certain shares of an estate, which was couched in terms not unlikely to recur. The most noteworthy point is, that while the direction to settle contained merely a restriction on the husband's control during the wife's life, the court added the usual clause against anticipation, and (considering the object of the will to be to give as large a dominion to the wife as was consistent with her protection and the rights of her issue), introduced a general power of appointment by will in default of children before the ultimate limitation to the personal representatives of the wife.

One other case (*Re Bodmin Mines*, 5 W. R. 300) we may mention, as illustrating what has more than once been declared, that the court takes no judicial notice of the peculiar mining regulations known as the cost-book system. The Master of the Rolls said that it was competent for the parties to such a mining concern to vary the system as they pleased, and that in the absence of written rules the only way of determining the power of the shareholders and officers was by looking at the ordinary course of their business. In this way the court arrived at the conclusion, that in this particular mine a committee appointed by a general meeting could accept a resignation of shares without insisting on the payment of arrears of calls.

Cases at Common Law specially Interesting to Attorneys.

JOINT-STOCK COMPANIES—LIABILITY OF SHAREHOLDERS.

Pedell v. Gueynn; *Gordon v. Official Manager of the Sea Assurance Company*, 5 W. R., Exch., 283; *Henderson v. The Royal British Bank*, ib., Q.B., 286.

By the two first of the above cases, the opinion of the Court of Exchequer has been elicited upon an important point in reference to the constitution of joint-stock companies, completely registered under 7 & 8 Vict., c. 110—viz., that if such company should accept, by the directors, a bill of exchange, it is no defence to an action thereon brought against the official manager—nor to a *scire facias* against an individual shareholder upon the judgment in such action—that by the deed of settlement, bills of exchange accepted by the directors are to be binding on the company and shareholders, and each of them, to the extent only of the respective shares held by them in the capital stock of the company, and no further, or otherwise.

As to the action, it is clear that if such a defence were admissible, the shareholders of a company registered under 7 & 8 Vict., c. 110, would be in a different position, in point of liability to third parties, from shareholders of a co-partnership not so registered, but whose affairs are managed by directors. But according to the considered decision of the full court of appeal in Chancery, in the case of *Greenwood*, 23 L. J., N. S., Ch. 966, the position of the two classes of shareholders is the same in this respect; and in neither case can they absolve themselves from the ordinary liabilities of partnership *quoad* third parties (see also the case of *Smith v. Hull Glass Company*, 11 C. B. 897, 927).

As to the *scire facias*, the judgment of the Court of Exchequer went upon the well-known principle of law, that, as an answer to proceedings in *scire facias* on a judgment, there can not be set up any matter which might have been pleaded to the action on which that judgment was obtained—a doctrine clearly established in the case of *Bradley v. Eyre*, 11 Mee & W. 432, and *Philips v. Lord Egremont*, 6 Q. B., 587.

In the last case (*Henderson v. The Royal British Bank*), the Court of Queen's Bench (in consultation and concurrence with the judges of the other courts) gave judgment upon another point of much interest, in connection with joint-stock companies. Judgment had been recovered against the bank (established under 7 & 8 Vict., c. 113), and the present application to the court was for leave to issue execution against one of the shareholders for the amount of such judgment; and his answer was, that he had been induced to become a shareholder by the fraud of the manager and directors; that he did not discover the fraud till after the bank had stopped payment; and that, on such discovery, he had disclaimed being a shareholder, and claimed to prove in the Bankruptcy Court, as a creditor in respect of the money he had paid for his shares. It was, however, unanimously determined that this was no answer to the present application; and that to allow the shareholder, after having become a partner, and received dividends till the bank stopped payment, to say he had been defrauded and would no longer be a shareholder, and so get rid of his liability to third parties, would be "monstrous injustice." The rule as prayed for was therefore made absolute.

ATTORNEY—TOWN CLERK—PARLIAMENTARY BUSINESS—REMUNERATION.

Morgan v. Corporation of Birmingham, 5 W. R., Ex., 291.

This was an action brought by the plaintiff, an attorney, to recover certain costs incurred while town clerk of the borough of B. The action (together with all other claims of the plaintiff) had been referred to a barrister, who, before making his award, requested the advice of the court as to the following question:—It appeared that in 1846, one Mr. Bray was town clerk of the borough; and while holding such office, a committee of the council, which had been appointed for that purpose, reported that the professional (as distinct from the routine) business "appurtenant to the office of town clerk," consisted of "parliamentary proceedings," perusing the daily votes of the House of Commons, and watching the bills likely to affect the interests of the borough, and also of business directed by the council and various committees, of conveyancing, prosecuting, and defending suits at law and in equity, and of other general business. And it was resolved, in consequence of this and other parts of their report, that the town clerk should for the future be paid by a salary of £800 for all business, "routine and appurtenant to the office," including all professional business ordered by the

mayor, council, or committee—but exclusive of money out of pocket. In August, 1852, Mr. Bray resigned; and previously to the appointment of his successor, it was determined by a resolution of the council, referring to, and grounded on, the above report, and on a subsequent report on the same subject, that a salary of £500 should be given for "all business, routine and appurtenant to the office, exclusive of money out of pocket," but that there should be also given a distinct allowance of £300 to cover the salaries of clerks, who (in consequence of business arising from the Improvement Act of 1851), would have to be engaged by any future town clerk. The plaintiff was subsequently appointed town clerk, and received the above salary and allowance, and continued in his office till October, 1854, when he resigned; and in February, 1855, delivered (with other claims) certain bills of costs for "parliamentary business performed by order of the council" in 1854 and 1855, to the amount of £800 and upwards. The items of these bills consisted of attendances in council and on committees, journeys to London, and correspondence in respect of certain local bills affecting the town. The plaintiff was paid his expenses out of pocket. The question for the opinion of the court was, whether the plaintiff was entitled to make such charges.

The court said that the plaintiff had accepted office under an appointment referring to a document in which the duties were specified; that part of those duties were "parliamentary proceedings;" that the matters now charged for were covered by that expression; and that he had failed to show any contract, express or implied, to be paid any sum in addition to the salary of the office.

Some of the observations of the Chief Baron, in delivering judgment, are worthy of remark. They are as follows:—"Some stress has been laid upon the fact of the plaintiff being an attorney, and that he may have had other business than that connected with the duties of his office. I am not aware that a town-clerk may not have business of his own. The case does not find whether that was so in this instance. But if it were, that an attorney undertook to perform the business appurtenant to the office of town-clerk, in the same way that he would undertake any other business that he might be retained or employed to transact for an ordinary client, I think that fact would have a material bearing upon the question of whether the salary excluded remuneration for any particular service."

ATTORNEY—ADVOCATE—PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATION.

Brown v. Foster 5 W. R., Ex., 292.

The real question in this case, which is of the utmost importance, not only to the barrister, but also to the attorney, in reference to his duty in those tribunals in which he can practice as an advocate, is how far he may or ought to disclose to the court any circumstance, the knowledge of which he has acquired in consequence of his being engaged as advocate for the party against whom it is to be used.

The action was for malicious prosecution, and the defence was a justification by reason of the embezzlement of the plaintiff when in the employ of the defendant as clerk. There had been two examinations before the magistrate in reference to the alleged embezzlement, at both of which the clerk was represented by E., a barrister. On the first of these, the day and cash-books were put in by the prosecutor, to show that a certain sum of money, which had been paid to the clerk, had not been entered by him in due course. The clerk was liberated on bail; and at the second examination before the magistrate, E. pointed out an entry which exonerated the clerk, and he was then discharged, and commenced the above action for malicious prosecution. At the trial of this action, it was suggested by the counsel for the defendant, that the entry in question had been made by the plaintiff between the first and second examinations before the magistrate. On this the judge (the late Chief Justice of the Common Pleas), after consulting Mr. Justice Cresswell, examined E. as to the condition of the book when in his hands as the plaintiff's counsel at the first examination before the magistrate. E. swore there was then no entry of the sum in question. Hereupon, the jury returned a verdict for the defendant, which it was now sought to set aside, on the ground that the evidence by E. should not have been received.

The judges (Pollock, C. B., and Barons Martin and Watson) refused to disturb the verdict, and seemed to entertain no doubt that if E. knew as a matter of fact, that the entry was made subsequent to the remand, he was bound, on being questioned, to disclose the truth, without reference to what effect his so doing might have upon his former client's interest; for that (in the case before the court) the inquiry in which such information

was given related to a different matter, and was between different parties; the case in which E. had been retained had been determined; the fact to which E. was asked to depose he could not, in any sense, be said to have acquired the knowledge of through any privileged communication, for the book in question was put in evidence by the prosecutor, and was before the magistrate.

The Court also intimated that no words of reprobation would be too strong as regarded the conduct of E., if it was necessary to believe that, when he pointed out the entry to the magistrate on the second occasion, he was aware that it was not in the book when he first examined it. But "it was just possible," said Mr. Baron Watson, "that E. did not, at the time he used the book, recollect that on the former occasion the entry was wanting, and may only have discovered afterwards that he had been deceived."

Correspondence.

DUBLIN.

(From our own Correspondent.)

The columns of the Dublin daily papers have been for nearly a week past, to a great extent, occupied by reports of two extraordinary trials that have been proceeding in the Queen's Bench and the Common Pleas respectively. These trials have arisen out of a somewhat complicated series of occurrences and letters; and the parties to them are the same in both actions, although in different characters. Mr. Arthur Smith, a solicitor in extensive practice in the city of Waterford, figured as plaintiff in the first action, and as defendant in the second; his adversary in both being Sir Benjamin Morris, Knt., also a resident in Waterford. These actions excited an amount of interest, both in legal circles and among the public, which is rarely equalled; and, as may be supposed, all the first men at the Common Law Bar, including Messrs. Brewster, Fitzgibbon, Whiteside, McDonough, and other Queen's Counsel, were arrayed on one side or the other. The action first tried was that of

SMITH v. MORRIS (C. P.),

in which Mr. Smith sought to recover damages for a libel penned by Sir Benjamin Morris upon the back of a cheque drawn by the latter upon the National Bank for a sum of money, being the amount of debt and costs in an action brought against him by certain clients of Mr. Smith. While paying the amount, Sir Benjamin gave vent to his feelings by endorsing on the cheque a statement to the effect that such payment was rendered necessary through fraud and perjury. As the only affidavit made in connection with the proceeding had been made by Mr. Smith, that gentleman very naturally came to the conclusion that those words conveyed an imputation on his character, and he accordingly brought this action. A vast amount of evidence was given on various collateral issues, to which it is not necessary to refer. The only point deserving of mention is one that, more than anything else, seemed to influence the minds of the jurors against Mr. Smith. On his own admission he had opened an envelope, enclosing a bill, which was lying at the bank, sealed up, and addressed to Lady Morris; his attempted justification for that act being, that, as solicitor for the Waterford branch of the bank, he was interested in discovering some alleged forgeries that had been committed, and that he was thus justified in opening any document in the custody of the bank. It will be seen that, in the opinion of the Lord Chief Justice, the excuse was not a valid one, as the motive was really a wish, by comparison of handwriting, to obtain evidence that could be made available in the cross action. In summing up, his lordship observed, that no one could doubt that by "perjury" in the words of the libel, was meant wilful and corrupt false swearing; and it was admitted that the endorsement on the cheque was aimed at Mr. Smith. It was his (the Lord Chief Justice's) duty to tell them that that was a libel, and being so that they must find a verdict for the plaintiff. His lordship then proceeded to detail the circumstances at length, and afterwards referred to the letter-opening. He could not agree that Mr. Smith was justified in doing that. He was not there to make strong observations, and he would only say that this was a question for Mr. Smith's own conscience; but to justify it on the ground of a desire to detect a forgery was all nonsense, for it was never acted upon. It was clearly, to his mind, a mode of obtaining proof of Lady Morris's handwriting, to further the other case then ripening; and he thought it was a means which ought not to have been resorted to. He then left it to the jury to say what amount of

damages should be given for this charge of perjury made against an attorney, and which was not attempted to be justified. After an absence of three minutes from the box, the jury returned with a verdict for the plaintiff—*Sixpence* damages.

SIR B. MORRIS & WIFE v. SMITH (Q. B.)

This was the other action for libel before referred to; and, involving a greater array of facts and correspondence, it occupied a longer time, and excited even more interest than the last. For five entire days was the court occupied in the investigation of a number of facts, most of them of little public importance, although more or less material to the question at issue. Briefly, the action arose out of the proceedings undertaken by Mr. Smith as attorney for some other persons who were aggrieved by certain anonymous letters said to have been written by Lady Morris. Mr. Smith's letter to a local journal—the libel on which this action was founded—contained certainly some very strong expressions impeaching the character of both Sir Benjamin and Lady Morris, and directly conveying a charge of forgery, and an insinuation that other and worse practices could be proved against Lady Morris. The pleas of justification put in by Mr. Smith opened, of course, a wide field of inquiry, and, among other questions, whether Lady Morris had really been guilty of the malpractices laid to her charge. A vast number of witnesses were examined on both sides, and Lady Morris emphatically negatived all the charges made against her. After a protracted inquiry, enlivened by some brilliant speeches of counsel, the Lord Chief Justice charged the jury, and they retired for half-an-hour; and, on their return, handed in their verdict, finding that the justification was not proved, and assessing for the plaintiffs £1,000 damages.

INCUMBERED ESTATES COURT.

It will be remembered that on the summary dismissal of Mr. Baron Richards from the senior commissionership, two courses were open to the Government—the appointment of a commissioner to transact the vast arrear of business in the vacant chamber, or else such new arrangements as might enable the two remaining commissioners to take up that business in addition to their own. The latter course would, however, have involved changes amounting to an entire reconstruction of the court, and would necessarily have occasioned very great delay, and consequent injury to a multitude of suitors. From the recent statement made by the Lord Chancellor in the House of Lords, it appears that the appointment of a successor to Mr. Baron Richards has been at length resolved on. The legal profession and the general public regard the question of the choice of this judicial officer with very great interest. On the selection of a competent man very much depends; and the nomination of one who does not possess the extensive legal knowledge and the practical ability required for the post would be regarded as a permanent injury to a system which has, on the whole, worked most beneficially for Ireland. Rumour has for the last two days given the commissionership to a learned gentleman whose practice at the bar is exceedingly limited, but who has been a reliable supporter of the Government in the Commons House, and has, therefore, undoubted claims to promotion. Let it not be supposed that legal offices are bestowed in Ireland as they have lately been bestowed in England. In deference to public opinion, the central Government places on the bench at Westminster Hall men of high reputation, large practice, and acknowledged ability. In Ireland, on the contrary, promotion in the majority of instances goes by religious tenets and parliamentary services.

The extensive influence which the Incumbered Estates Court possesses over the entire landed system of Ireland, becomes daily more apparent. It is a difficult matter to find a purchaser for any property, large or small, unless the advantage, so highly appreciated by buyers, of a "parliamentary title," can be guaranteed. Advertisements daily appear in the public journals of sums of money to lend on mortgage; and it is a rare occurrence to find the "incumbered estates title" not required by the proposed lender. It is not surprising, therefore, that Lord Cranworth states, as his opinion, that the Incumbered Estates Court should be made a permanent institution of this country. Under the present act the court will come to a close somewhere about the end of July, 1858.

It appears from a return (dated 13th February) that the total number of petitions presented in the Incumbered Estates Court is 4,048; the total amount realised by the sales up to the present time is £19,626,177 : 17 : 8.

THE ATTORNEYS AND THE BAR.

A correspondence appears in the Dublin journals on a subject which may be denominated a standing difficulty—the non-attendance of counsel in courts in which they have accepted briefs. It might have been hoped that the admirable example set by the leading equity counsel in London would have been followed elsewhere, and that Queen's Counsel would, ere this, have ceased to accept briefs without a reasonable expectation of appearing when the cases are called on. It seems, however, that for some reason or other the unsatisfactory practice not only prevails, but promises to endure, of each leader going into all the courts, and, consequently, attending properly to his business in none of them.

The correspondence alluded to is between the Incorporated Law Society, represented by its secretary, and Sir Thos. Staples, Bart., the senior member of the Irish Bar, and, for such purposes, its representative. The first letter states that the council, impelled by a sense of public duty, on former occasions complained, and now with more reason complains, of the evils arising from the absence of counsel, and that strong observations have been made by the Lord Chief Justice, showing the necessity for some regulation securing the more regular attendance of counsel. The answer of Sir T. Staples on behalf of the Bar is a most unsatisfactory document. It states that the remedy for the inconvenience complained of rests with the solicitors themselves, and that the bar as a body cannot interfere. It also states that no regulation of the kind proposed has been adopted by the English Common Law Bar, and that no further step can be taken with reference to the subject. A more fallacious comparison could not have been instituted than that attempted by the representative of the Irish Bar. It is well known that not more than half-a-dozen leading counsel in Dublin confine themselves to the courts of equity—the others accept briefs in all the courts. As some ten or twelve courts are sitting daily, it may well be imagined that the greatest public inconvenience results from this indiscriminate acceptance of briefs: the exception is to find counsel ready when a case is called on. Ubiquity is by no means a characteristic of even the most eminent *Nisi Prius* advocates. The only remedy will be for the common law leaders to follow the example of the leaders at Lincoln's Inn, and choose one court. Why an expedient so simple and efficacious, and which has already proved so satisfactory to counsel and to suitors, should be regarded with abhorrence by the English Common Law Bar, and by the entire Bar of Ireland, it is difficult to comprehend.

LAW AND LAWYERS.

To the Editor of THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL & REPORTER.

SIR,—Permit me, as a country practitioner, to express through you my gratification at the bold career of law reform upon which the Attorney-General has entered, and my concurrence in the views which you have taken of our true policy and duty at this crisis.

It has been the fault of legal publications in general that they address the members of the profession as having rights and interests distinct from and conflicting with those of the community at large. We have been exhorted to agitate against the certificate duty—against the abolition of copyholds and of ecclesiastical courts—to claim compensation for the loss of every petty office and department of business—in short, to do battle for every abuse by which we are supposed to profit. We have been represented as rightfully endowed with the emoluments of an existing system, however vicious, and to some, in virtue of special offices, are ascribed privileges which can be compared to nothing but letters of marque. A disguise is, of course, thrown over the argument to make it decent, but this is its real import. Nothing can be more unjust—nothing more degrading to the profession which it is meant to serve.

In opposition to all this you rightly contend that it is the highest interest of the profession to be in harmony with the wants and feelings of the community; and that to this end every member of it should be mindful that lawyers were made for mankind, and not mankind for the lawyers. There is an analogy in principle between the solicitor and the surgeon in their relations to the public, and it would be well if there were a closer analogy in practice. As a man ought not to have more physic, so he ought not to have more law, than his case requires. Does the surgeon assert a vested interest in disease? Does he claim compensation for the loss of small pox by the enforcement of vaccination? No; he knows that his art will be resorted to in proportion to the evils it can remedy or relieve. So the only basis on which the rights of the solicitor should

stand is his usefulness—in his trusty counsels and welcome help in the exigencies of civil life. It is only thus that he can occupy that honourable place in the estimation of his neighbours for which he is generally qualified by talents and education. And how is it that he too frequently does not?—that an amiable character and intellectual attainments do not exempt him from ignoble suspicion, from many a shrug of distrust? It is because the law itself has not commanded the respect of the people—so whimsical and mysterious have been its rules and processes, and so burdensome its expenses; and because too many lawyers have been so miserably short-sighted as to resist the improvements which the times require. Selfishness is almost always short-sighted, and it is so in this case. For I feel convinced that not only our higher interest—namely, our honour and influence—but also that lower interest to which our advocates too often appeal—namely, our pecuniary advantage—will ever be advanced exactly in proportion as it is brought into accord with the general interests of society.

Experience abundantly shows that the more legal processes are simplified, and the delay and expense of them diminished, the better reason has the lawyer to rejoice with his client. Every country practitioner—conversant as he is with the lesser and most numerous transactions—can tell the prodigious impulse afforded to Chancery business by the improvement of the procedure and to conveyancing by the abolition of the lease for a year, the reduction of the stamp duty, and the encouragement given to short deeds. He can now effect three conveyancing transactions at less cost to his client, and more profit to himself, than two before; and he has now three comparatively contented, instead of two murmuring clients. He can now permit his clients to resort to Chancery for the construction of a will or the remedy of a defect, instead of depending, as heretofore, on clumsy compromises and indemnities.

The country practitioners, who are beginning to be alarmed at the prospect of a registration of titles, are startled at a shadow. No matter what form the amendment of conveyancing practice may assume—if it do but facilitate and cheapen transfers—it must be a benefit to them. I do not expect that conveyancing will be deprived of its scientific character, and that we shall be reduced to be the drudges of a mechanical routine; and so long as science shall be requisite, there need be no fear that proficiency will ever be without employment. In the numerous minor transactions with which we are conversant, the circuitous and expensive processes of conveyancing are never observed. They are guarded against by special contracts or general understanding. We are generally content with a *prima facie* legal estate and a moral assurance of title. Not one title in a thousand is disputed; not one contract in 500 is required to be enforced *ad inritum*; time quickly supplies a presumption as strong as proof; and therefore the array of attested copies, registers, inspections, covenants, and affidavits which technical routine prescribes are boldly dispensed with. We are compelled to adopt this course by stress of economy. The transaction must be accomplished for a trifle, or not at all. The responsibility we thus incur is often onerous, and always unfair—because, so far from receiving a premium for the risk, it is incurred for the very purpose of diminishing our emolument. Under an improved system we may hope to avoid this risk, and to provide our clients with unexceptionable titles at an expense which shall not discourage the smallest transaction. From this will result an increase of business which must redound both to our credit and advantage.

I would, however, suggest to our law societies in London and the provinces that they should urge upon the framers of the new measures the expediency of consulting, upon their details, country solicitors, who are familiar with the operation of the law upon the numerous class of yeomen and shopkeepers. The project for a general registration of deeds elaborated four years ago was framed in total ignorance of country practice, and of the large proportion (not less than four-fifths) which sales and mortgages under £500 bear to the whole; and no sooner was it confronted with this fact than it collapsed, and was most properly abandoned.

Feb. 9.

Your obedient servant,

LEX ET GREX.

REGISTRATION OF PARTNERSHIP.

To the Editor of THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL & REPORTER.

SIR,—Lord Brougham said, at the interview with Lord Palmerston on the 30th ultimo, in speaking of the registration of partnerships, that it might be said to be in some degree connected with the question of limited liability. Although this is not noticed in your report of his lordship's address, yet, as the

opinion was expressed in the hearing of a large number of delegates, I am anxious to correct the prejudicial effect upon an important question, which this, as it appears to me, erroneous view of his lordship is calculated to produce. That the registration of private partnerships is quite distinct from, and independent of, the limited liability question, will, I think, be clear when the objects of registration are understood. They are twofold—first, to enable persons about to deal with a firm to judge of its trustworthiness; and, second, to enable those who desire to enforce by legal proceedings claims against a firm, to know how to frame the legal process, as a firm cannot be sued in the superior courts in England, unless in the process be stated the Christian and surnames of every partner, and hence the chief necessity for registration; so that, if limited liability had never been mooted, the reasons for the registration would be precisely the same, and of as much strength as now they are. Moreover, the law already admits of partnerships of limited liability, under certain conditions—one of which is, that the partners' names, and certain other particulars, shall be registered; and whether this principle be extended, or be kept within its present bounds, the reasons for a registration of private partnerships will remain the same, and the registration of such partnerships would not affect the argument for or against the principle of limited liability. Let no one, therefore, hesitate to sanction the principle of a registration of the names of partners constituting trading firms, from a fear that it is a sanction of this principle.

I observe, in your last number, a long letter in recommendation of the superintendent registrars of births, marriages, and deaths being made the local officers of the new testamentary courts, and that reference is made to the Manchester scheme for making these officers the registrars for partnerships. The writer of that letter is evidently intimately acquainted with the duties of superintendent registrars, but he does not make out to my mind any case for their selection. I will mention one objection: they are *parochial* officers, and in each city or borough there may be, and generally are, several parishes. In Birmingham there are three parishes, and three superintendent registrars; and if these gentlemen were to be the registrars for partnerships, or for wills, three searches might have to be made instead of one in every case. This consideration, I think, must, to every impartial person, be a sufficient condemnation of such a selection. The fitness of the registrar of joint-stock companies for a similar office for private partnerships does not depend alone on his superiority to the superintendent registrars of births, &c. Many good reasons exist independently of this comparison, but which it is not necessary here to state.

I am, &c., your obedient servant,

Birmingham, Feb. 10.

ARTHUR RYLAND.

To the Editor of THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL & REPORTER.

SIR,—A point of considerable importance to the profession has arisen in practice, upon which I am anxious to elicit the opinion of your readers. Recently, on sale of a reversionary interest, I obtained and furnished certain statutory declarations, as evidence of the vendor's identity, &c.; but the purchaser's legal advisers objected to accept them, because they had been made before commissioners to administer oaths in Chancery, as they had not power, it was contended, to take declarations; on the other hand, I submitted that, inasmuch as, from time out of mind, masters extra in Chancery, before the passing of the act of 6 & 7 Will. 4, c. 62, had taken voluntary oaths, such masters had power to take voluntary declarations, and that the act of 16 & 17 Vict. c. 78, only changed the name of such officers to "commissioners;" besides which it is specially provided by that act, that the commissioners should discharge such duties, and have such powers, &c., as by "usage in that behalf or otherwise" they had previously.

I am, your obedient servant,

26, New Broad-st., City.

G. R. DODD.

Feb. 6, 1857.

Review.

An Introduction to the Principles and Practice of Pleading in Civil Actions, &c. By WATKIN WILLIAMS, Esq., Barrister-at-law. Butterworths.

The "science of special pleading" is as extinct as are any of the grim Saurians at Sydenham. Its existence, indeed, was but a brief one, for he who called it into action still lives to mourn its decay. Some forty years ago a young pleader had occasion, in

the pursuit of a somewhat extensive practice of his art, to ponder over the law of pleading as it then lay scattered through "the books;" and his habit of mind led him to endeavour to deduce from the decisions he found, general rules for future use. Our investigator discovered that these points, apparently unconnected, and emanating, through the course of centuries, from very different men, were yet connected in this—that they resulted from the application of certain fixed principles to different combinations of circumstances. By slow degrees, these principles emerged under his research, and they appeared well defined, consistent with each other, and fit, in short, to become the foundation of a scientific study. The inquirer, we need hardly tell our youngest reader, was Mr. Serjeant Stephen; and the system he laid down was that which is to be found in his "Treatise on the Principles of Pleading in Civil Actions."

Had we more space at our command, it would not be difficult to point out how rudely these rules have been disturbed by the framers of the Common Law Procedure Act of 1852; but a few instances are all that can be here attempted. Thus, the very first of them—viz., that "after the declaration, the parties must at each stage demur or plead"—is no longer fully in force; for, says 15 & 16 Vict. c. 76, s. 80, "either party may, by leave of the court or of a judge, plead and demur to the same pleading at the same time," &c. Then fell with a stroke of the Commissioners' pen the whole fabric of "special," as distinguished from "general" demurrers—a distinction in which the Serjeant naturally revelled. The "special" traverse, indeed, had even in his time fallen in great measure into disuse, and might, he hints, be dispensed with, without much loss to the general system. But the most important inroads on the pleading of his day, are those which infringe upon the rules he lays down as tending "to produce certainty or particularity in the issue." It cannot now be said with any of that universality of application which is essential to a fundamental proposition, that "pleadings must have certainty of place or time;" that they must "specify quality, quantity, or value," or "names;" or that they must show "title," or "authority." The wide rule that "whatever is alleged in pleading must be alleged with certainty," is now liable to qualifications and exceptions which did not exist when it was first propounded—and the same may be said of most of the other canons which the Serjeant so industriously collected, and so lucidly explained. And we do not hesitate to say that the change—while it has tended to diminish the length and, therefore, the expense of pleadings, and, above all, the risk of ultimate failure in the action commenced, and must, consequently, be hailed as a blessing by that portion of the public whose vocation it is to sue and be sued—has entirely destroyed the symmetry of special pleading; and its professors have become empirics, more or less successful, instead of being graduates in an art governed by fixed laws and scientific principles. It may be true that to draw a plea or a declaration as much care as ever is required—nay, perhaps, as much skill—but the care is with a different object, and the skill is of a different kind. It is no longer sought to adapt fixed principles to ever-varying complications of facts, but the sole endeavour is to satisfy the mind of Mr. Justice A. or Mr. Baron B. that the pleading expresses in intelligible language, and without violating the recognised meaning of any term of art, the cause of action or of defence relied upon; and so that the true controversy between the parties may be determined in the existing suit.

We have been led to these reflections by the "Introduction to the Principles and Practice of Pleading in Civil Actions," which has recently been published by Mr. Watkin Williams; and we examined the work with much curiosity to see what the author would make of his emasculated subject. Our curiosity, however, was doomed to remain unsatisfied, for it appears that the present volume is an instalment only of the entire work. It treats of the proceedings generally in and incidental to an action, and not of the principles on which the mutual allegations between the parties to the suit should be framed with regard to the law as it now stands. It is, in short, an extended edition only of the first chapter of its celebrated predecessor, which, as our readers may remember, is entitled "Of the Proceedings in an Action from its Commencement to its Termination," and forms a model which all the recent writers on the subject of an action at law have freely imitated.

Upon the whole, nevertheless, we have been much pleased with Mr. Williams. We honour greatly patient industry and original thinking whenever we discover their traces. And the volume before us bears ample evidence that its author spared neither research nor meditation before he appeared in print. His plan is an extensive one, if viewed merely as an introduction to the principal task he has undertaken. He sketches the

rise and progress of the three superior courts of law and their several jurisdictions; explains how the ancient methods of procedure gradually took the form of those now in use; and then he takes the reader rapidly through the different steps of an action, from the issuing of the writ of summons down to its termination. All this, indeed, has been done before; but it is here neatly re-cast, and our only objection to the execution of this part of the volume is, that it has been worked up too much in detail for the purposes of the student, while it is far too slender to be available in practice: in fact, it displays too openly the process of its construction. We have the result of a young man's reading for his profession, a species of commonplace book under the head of "Action at Law," which is most satisfactory as a voucher of the industrious student, but is scarcely fit to be given to the world at large. The nature of Mr. Williams's present volume, therefore, will sufficiently account for our abstaining from any detailed commentary upon its contents. We find no fault (as the general rule) either with the matter or the style of the author. He appears to us to have read up his subject well, to have thoroughly made up his mind what he wanted to say, and to have been able to express his meaning with precision. The occasional want of keeping (in artistic phrase) which is perceptible, arises chiefly from his anxiety to tell us all he knows; for, of course, all the points he has studied do not possess an equal degree of interest to his readers.

As a specimen of the manner in which Mr. Williams handles his theme we will instance the divisions he gives of actions. Scorning to abandon to its fate the ancient learning upon this subject, which (so far as regarded the distinction between real and mixed actions) had become somewhat hazy even so long ago as 1825, when Roscoe wrote his Treatise upon actions relating to real property, he entangles himself in a needless refinement in reference to the present action of ejectment. At page 42, he says:—"This action is now in general a real action only; but in actions by landlord against tenant it is a mixed action, and in this case the jury may award damages for the profits during the time that the tenant wrongfully held possession."

Of this distinction, however, we cannot approve. We apprehend, that to consider the present action as connected in any way with the ancient lore above alluded to, would only breed confusion in the mind of the student. When Mr. Williams chooses to call it a "real" action, merely because by the judgment the court adjudges the plaintiff to be entitled to the premises he claims, we think a mischievous attempt is made to adapt the creation of modern convenience to a classification which was the result of technicalities long since exploded. The present action cannot claim the slightest relationship with the remedies given under the name of real actions in the books, lacking, as it does, their various incidents of "original writs," "essoigns," "grand and petit capes," and the like. And this truth the student ought to know *in limine*, and not to be left to find it out for himself after much unnecessary trouble. Indeed, we are disposed to cavil at Mr. Williams's own law here; for the form of ejectment, superseded by the Common Law Procedure Act of 1852, though denominated a "mixed" action by 3 & 4 Will. 4, c. 27, and stated by Mr. Williams to be so considered immediately before the passage we have quoted, was, in its form, a species of the personal action of trespass, as explained in works of authority. And another of our author's positions in the same part of his work is, we think, open to question. He classes *detinue* and *assumpsit* both as actions of contract, whereas both of them seem technically founded on *tort*. As to the first, indeed, we apprehend there can be little doubt, although it is enumerated by Chitty as an action *ex contractu*. The injury on which it is founded is the *detention* of the chattel, not necessarily the breach of any contract between the owner and the person to whom the possession has passed; and accordingly it is so classed by Mr. Serjeant Stephen in the third volume of his Commentaries, p. 452. And as to *assumpsit*, it is properly a form only of trespass on the case (see Steph. Pl., p. 42, 4th edit.), although no doubt often treated as a separate class.

We believe that Mr. Williams will feel obliged to us for these observations, for they will show him that his work has been examined in no careless spirit, but with a thorough appreciation of its aim and pretensions. Neither will he take amiss from us an exhortation to use still greater diligence, and to bestow still closer consideration on the remainder of his work, and before he lays down principles for the new system of pleading. It is on the execution of this part of his undertaking that his reputation must ultimately depend. For what he has already performed he can, at best, only hope to receive the praise of a successful compiler from works already before the profession. If

he would emulate the fame of Stephen, he must produce the same results as he did. To any *discoverer*, in whatever art or science, the world cheerfully pays homage; and Wöhler could not more truly claim that name, when he drew his *aluminium* from the clayey compound in his crucible, than the Serjeant, when he deduced out of his mental alembic the hidden principles of pleading, which the "year-books," and the "digests," and the "abridgments" of his library held, in combination with an infinite amount of dross. Let Mr. Williams perform a similar feat, and he will receive the same reward.

Law Amendment Society.

CONSULS AND CONSULAR DUTIES.

A meeting was held on Saturday at the rooms of this Society, under the direction of the Mercantile Law Committee of the United Kingdom, to hear a paper read by E. U. A. Tuson, Esq., Chancellor of the Austrian consulate in London.

Lord BROUGHAM took the chair; the audience included Mr. W. Ewart, M.P., Mr. Headlam, M.P., Mr. Hadfield, M.P., Mr. W. Hawes, and Mr. Pitt Taylor.

The paper opened with an explanation of the word "consul"—traced the history of the consular office from the days of Lucius Junius, when it was first established, to the present time—recited all the acts of the British Parliament relating to and regulating the duties of consuls, explaining their several provisions by an elaborate detail of their marginal notes, and described the intention and effect of all orders in council upon the subject. Passing from this historical review, the writer proceeded to notice certain defects in our own consular system, the most prominent of which were an inequality of power and authority in different consulates; the appointment of persons to the office, especially in the Levant, who were engaged in commerce, and who frequently used their official character as a means of extending their private trade, occasionally in a very unfair and oppressive manner; and the appointment of persons ignorant of consular duties, and of the circumstances and peculiarities of the countries to which they are accredited. He suggested that the powers of the British consul should in all cases be defined by treaty, similar to the treaties by which the powers and authority of the United States consuls in France, Belgium, and other nations, were defined; that a proper code of instructions and regulations should be laid down to which British consuls in every part of the world should be required to conform; that no person engaged in mercantile or other trading pursuits, or any naval or military officer, should be eligible to the office; that a system of *élèves* should be introduced, and that from these *élèves*, a certain number of whom should be attached to each consulate for instruction, the consular agents and consuls should in future be selected according to the ability displayed; and he recommended that in no case should the salary attaching to the office of consular agent be lower than £200 a year.

The CHAIRMAN expressed the obligation of the members to Mr. Tuson for his instructive paper, but observed that he had been under the impression that consuls were not now permitted to engage in trading transactions on their own account. The education of consuls, as suggested by Mr. Tuson, was a matter of high importance.

Mr. TUSON said that in many foreign ports, particularly in the Levant, the consular representatives of Great Britain were still traders, and the dignity and influence of the office suffered in consequence. In reply to a question, he subsequently added, that the salaries of these persons did not in many instances exceed £70 a year.

Mr. W. EWART moved the thanks of the meeting to the lecturer, and that the subject be referred to the Mercantile Law Committee. In doing so he gave it as his opinion that the consular representatives of Great Britain should in all cases be Englishmen. He believed that it was the practice both with France and America to appoint none but their own subjects as consuls. He perfectly concurred in the recommendation as to the appointment of *élèves*.

The motion was seconded by Mr. HEADLAM, who, as chairman of the Mercantile Law Committee, remarked that the changes suggested, in the propriety of which he fully concurred, were such as might be carried into effect by the executive government without any alteration of the law.

The resolution was carried unanimously, and after some further remarks the meeting broke up.

Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE.

A meeting of the Managing Committee was held on Wednesday, the 18th instant, when the Secretary reported a letter received from Ireland, stating that the profession there experienced considerable difficulty in protecting their interests, owing to their distance from the seat of legislation; and that, with the concurrence of the Chairman, he had opened a communication with an influential body of solicitors in that country, with a view to establish arrangements for friendly co-operation and assistance in matters of mutual interest.

A report of the Assistant-Secretary on the Bankruptcy Laws and their Administration, was read. It referred to some of the chief evils in the working of the present system, and after noticing suggestions as to the direction in which reform might be sought, concluded by recommending the appointment of a sub-committee to confer with a committee of the Law Amendment Society, who are now considering the subject. A sub-committee was accordingly appointed, to consider the report, and to represent the committee in relation to the subject of bankruptcy, in conference with the Law Amendment Society.

Letters complaining of the arbitrary interference of the Treasury in the taxation of costs on criminal prosecutions were read, the consideration of which had been postponed by the committee, while the new scale of equity costs was unsettled; and it was resolved that further inquiries be made, with a view to action, on the part of the committee, for the protection of the profession.

The following law bills, recently introduced into Parliament, were brought up and referred for consideration:—Judgments Execution, &c., Imprisonment for Debt, Vexatious Litigation Prevention, Probates and Letters of Administration, Divorce and Matrimonial Causes, Property of Married Women, and Judicial Statistics.

The following address has been issued to the provincial members of the committee and the local law societies:—

ADDRESS OF COMMITTEE.

The committee desire to bring under the notice of the association some of the subjects which appear likely to engage the attention of Parliament during the next few months; and they hope that this programme, suggestive of future proceedings, may secure from the members such assistance as will enable them, by means of the association, to give an effective expression of opinion upon the following matters:—

TRANSFER OF LAND.—The Royal Commission appointed, on the recommendation of a Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1853, to consider the subject of registration of title, with reference to facilitating the sale and transfer of land, have not yet made a report; but from the speech at Aylesbury of the Attorney-General, a distinguished member of the commission, it may be inferred that they have determined on a scheme which is to be shaped into a legislative measure, and brought forward in the ensuing session.

When the details of the scheme are made public, they must receive the earnest attention of the association; and the committee would forewarn their fellow members, that if the plan shadowed forth in the report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons (printed Aug. 5, 1853), and in the Attorney-General's speech before referred to, should be adopted, it will involve a total subversion of existing conveyancing practice; and it will be essential that the profession should be unanimous in demanding that such a change should be accompanied by an alteration in the present system of professional remuneration—at any rate, so far as it is applicable to conveyancing practice.

The members of the association are aware how objectionable to the whole profession is the present system of remuneration as applied to Chancery business. The efforts of the association have long been directed to its improvement, and the committee would refer particularly to their sixth circular issued 19th July, 1855, in which the whole subject is fully dealt with.

The committee are of opinion, however, that this matter of remuneration for Chancery business is really insignificant in comparison with the importance of the great change now proposed. By the new scheme, the legal ownership of land is to be evidenced, and its transfer to purchasers and mortgages effected, much in the same way as is now done with reference to stock or shares, leaving *beneficial interests* to be dealt with as such interests in stock or shares are now dealt with; some register, also, of legal ownership is to be established, and probably some plan of granting

parliamentary titles superadded, after the manner of the Encumbered Estates Court in Ireland. Now, if this plan is adopted, and the present mode of remuneration is allowed to remain, the measure will prove most destructive to all those who depend mainly upon their conveyancing practice. The rules of law as they prevail at present, declare, in substance, that the profession shall be remunerated, not on the basis of the skill displayed, and the responsibility incurred in the transaction of any business, but on the length of the documents prepared. The effect of the proposed scheme will be to shorten conveyances so materially as to destroy the present mode of remuneration; and it will be necessary, therefore, for the profession to take care that another system is introduced, by which the practitioner shall be paid, not according to the length or multiplicity of written forms, but according to the measure of skill and labour required, and the responsibility incurred.

ECCLESIASTICAL.—The committee, in their annual report for the year 1855, refer to the striking unanimity of opinion which has so long prevailed, with respect to the expediency of introducing certain changes in that branch of jurisprudence at present administered in the Ecclesiastical Courts. All have arrived at the conclusion that the needed reform in matters testamentary, to be efficient, must provide for the total abolition of the Ecclesiastical, Peculiar, and Manorial Courts, the extinction of the doctrine of *bona notabilia*, and the destruction of the monopoly at present enjoyed by the advocates and proctors in Doctors' Commons. At this point, however, unanimity of opinion ceases. When the nature and functions of the new tribunal or tribunals to be henceforward intrusted with testamentary jurisdiction are considered, the most irreconcilable opinions are expressed. A very general opinion, indeed, appears to prevail, that any court on which testamentary jurisdiction is to be conferred, should be one of universal jurisdiction, and should be empowered to grant probate of wills of real as well as of personal estate; and that, in certain cases, probates and letters of administration should be granted by local tribunals. On other points, however, great difference of opinion exists. Many contend that no new court should be established at all, but that all testamentary jurisdiction should be transferred to the superior courts of common law and the county courts. Some seem anxious to attach the whole of this jurisdiction to the Court of Chancery; others again recommend the establishment of a new court of common law, with a single judge and with common law procedure; while the Lord Chancellor, in his new bill for amending the law relating to probates and letters of administration, proposes a new court

common law, to be presided over by a Chancery judge. The Lord Chancellor's measure must not, however, be thus summarily disposed of; and the following outline of its provisions may, perhaps, enable the profession to judge whether it is likely to prove satisfactory. It provides for the establishment of a new court, to be called the Court of Probate, which is to have all jurisdiction in relation to the granting of probates and letters of administration, now exercised by any Ecclesiastical, Peculiar, or Manorial Courts in England, and over which one of the Vice-Chancellors is to preside, assisted by the clerks and officers now employed in the Prerogative Court of Canterbury. The new court is to have, throughout England, the same powers, and to observe the same procedure, as the Prerogative Court of Canterbury; but power is given to direct issues on any question of fact, to be tried in the courts of common law in the same manner as an issue may now be directed by the Court of Chancery. The proctors are to retain the monopoly of the common form business, while the contentious business is to be thrown open to solicitors and attorneys, who, together with proctors and advocates, are to have the right of practising in the new court. With regard to wills bequeathing property up to £1,500, it is proposed that, if uncontested, they should be proved in district courts, but if contested, they should be proved in London. Wills which dispose of personal property under £200, and of real property under £300, are to be decided on by the county courts.

The committee refrain from expressing any positive opinion upon the measure at present. They are apprehensive, however, that it will not be found generally satisfactory; and they will state the reasons upon which they found that opinion when the bill has reached a subsequent stage.

COMMERCIAL LAW.—The committee, in alluding to commercial law, would express an earnest hope that the Legislature will, without delay, take into consideration the subject of our bankruptcy laws and their administration, the chief evils of which are, their want of uniformity, and the multiplicity of courts which take cognisance of the same matters; the expenses

of administration; the irregularity of attendance at court on the part of the commissioners and registrars; the formalism with which many operations of the court are encumbered; the inadequate nature of the punishments awarded to fraudulent bankrupts; and the unsatisfactory nature of the present system of appeal.

The present state of the law for winding-up insolvent companies is creating wide-spread dissatisfaction among the profession and the public; and the committee would urge upon the members the necessity of devising some plan with a view to prevent that discreditable conflict of jurisdictions recently exhibited in the case of the Royal British Bank. With the observations of Lord Justice Knight Bruce the committee cordially agree:—

"It is to be hoped that the Legislature will take steps to prevent the recurrence of conflicts and complications such as the proceedings before us exhibit and portend; miserable conflicts, distressing complications, characterised by the grave frivolity, the costly uselessness, the sickening delay in which chicanery rejoices; conflicts and complications which must embitter the anxiety, and add weight to the oppression of sufferers under nefariously conducted schemes, such as the thing ironically called the Royal British Bank; conflicts and complications which to a civilised people are nationally discreditable, and in a governed country ought not to be possible."

PARTNERSHIP.—The registration of partners in private partnerships is also a question of great moment. At present there is no mode of ascertaining who are partners in a firm. Some firms comprise many partners, but are represented by one name. There are others with the words "and Co.," containing several partners; and there are others with that addition, yet having no partners at all. Mr. Ryland, in his paper read at Liverpool, suggests that every private partnership should be required to send to the registrar of joint-stock companies the name and residence of every member of the partnership, and the particulars of every change in the members, and that the non-registry may be pleaded, and shall be a good plea in bar, to any action at the suit of the partnership. The committee might usefully lay the views of the association on this matter before Parliament, in case the law of partnership should be discussed, as it probably will be, in the approaching session. Members are, therefore, invited to communicate their opinion touching this subject.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE STATUTE LAW.—The important subject of the consolidation of the statute law should receive attention on the part of the association. Something has undoubtedly been done, and bills for consolidating the statute law relating to indictable offences have been printed, and will be presented during the session. This is, however, but a very small portion of the work to be accomplished. No plan can be accepted as efficient or satisfactory which does not provide for the annually increasing acts of Parliament, as well as for existing statutes; and it would be greatly conducive to the public convenience if the Statute Law Commissioners should select those subjects for consolidation which are most urgently requiring the interference of Parliament. The committee cannot but express their regret and disappointment that so little progress has been made; and they think that more effectual means for attaining the desired object—the consolidation of the present and a periodical consolidation of future statutes—should be forthwith adopted.

CRIMINAL LAW.—PUBLIC PROSECUTORS.—Among those questions affecting the interests of the country practitioner, that of the appointment of public prosecutors, which arose at the aggregate meeting at Liverpool, on the reading of a paper by Mr. C. A. Smith, Secretary to the Justices' Clerks Society, is most important. The scheme recommended in the report of the committee of the House of Commons is the appointment of district prosecutors, with a staff of agents—a scheme which presents objections most formidable.

The intervention of a public officer, irresponsible to the suitor, to perform functions which are now entrusted by the client to his own legal adviser, who would have no motive for exertion beyond a sense of duty; the dislike with which juries regard prosecutions conducted by the Government; the unfavorable feelings and opinions generally entertained towards Government functionaries—feelings and opinions which might be excited so as to prevent the services of a prosecutor being beneficial to the public; the enormous patronage that would be at the disposal of the Government, and the further consideration as to how that patronage would be likely to be exercised; the fact that cases sometimes arise where prosecutions have to be instituted against the servants of the Executive (police-officers, for instance, for excess of duty)—cases which it would not be desirable to intrust to a regularly appointed

Government official; the heavy annual expenditure; the important fact that where respectable attorneys are employed, prosecutions are, as a rule, well and satisfactorily conducted under the existing system;—all these considerations constitute so many serious objections against the proposal put forth in the report of the House of Commons, that the committee are decidedly of opinion, that the appointment of public prosecutors upon the plan suggested, would be productive of injury, instead of benefit, to the administration of justice.

The committee are aware that some prosecutions do undoubtedly fail, either on account of the absence of proper preliminary proceedings, or through the non-existence of sufficient evidence to support the case; they think, however, that this evil is to be traced to the fact, that respectable and competent attorneys avoid undertaking prosecutions because they frequently impose a loss or inadequate remuneration; and they are of opinion that the simplest and most effective remedy would be to pay the attorney fairly, in order that he may be induced to do the work properly.

The committee regret to find that the opposite course is now being systematically adopted by the Government.

Government taxing officers—men who are unrecognised by the law or by custom—are now going round to every assize town throughout the kingdom, to tax counsel's and attorneys' fees, and to reduce allowances to constables and witnesses to the lowest possible figure, upon the plea, that, the costs being paid out of the consolidated fund, Government has a right to superintend the taxation of those costs. The functions of the established officers, the clerks of arraigns at assizes, and the clerks of the peace at sessions, are superseded, and their scale of allowances set aside. The result of this proceeding is, that respectable attorneys, as a rule, avoid criminal business, which, therefore, frequently falls into incompetent hands.

The committee entertain a strong and decided opinion, that free competition, and adequate remuneration, will secure the due and proper administration of the criminal law, by making it worth the while of able attorneys to undertake criminal business, and that the present evils are owing to a parsimony, unfair to the practitioner, and injurious to the public.

The committee, in concluding this address, would urge upon the profession the necessity of forming and expressing an opinion upon the subjects here referred to; and they also hope that the interest excited by the meeting at Liverpool may not be permitted to pass away without leading to a considerable accession of members. They would, therefore, suggest that local meetings be summoned during the present assizes, first of all, to consider, and report to the committee upon this address, and then to take immediate steps for increasing the number of subscribers, and consequently the resources of the association, without which it is obvious that the exertions of the committee, however great, must fall short of the objects to which they are directed.

Parliamentary Proceedings.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Friday, Feb. 13.

RIGHTS OF MARRIED WOMEN.

LORD BROUGHAM called the attention of the House to the question of the right of property of married women. He reminded the House that he had some time since presented a petition to their lordships from upwards of 2,000 married women, complaining of the state of the law upon this subject. Amongst the names of those signing the petition were many women who earned their bread by daily labour, many who adorned the literature of this country. By the law of England every penny which these women earned was the property of their husbands. His lordship cited several instances of the present working of the law. The evil being then apparent, the question arose as to the remedy. The general opinion was in favour of one course—viz., to do that for those who were without a settlement which was done for those who died without a will. If a man died without a will, the law made a will for him, directing how the property should go amongst the next of kin; so where people married without a settlement, it was proposed that the law should make a settlement for them. This was the law in the greater part of the United States of America; it had answered most perfectly. The French law made a provision for meeting the case of an evil-doing husband, and upon this another remedy was suggested by some. By the French law the wife could obtain an *autorisation*, which operated as a stop-order, restraining the husband and his creditors from interfering with the property of the wife.

There was nothing that he could add to these facts. He should, therefore, move three resolutions. First, that the law ought to be amended; secondly, that the wife ought to have the entirety of her property; and, thirdly, that until the second resolution could be carried out, or if it could not be carried out, the French system of the *autorisation* should be imported into our law.

LORD GRANVILLE said that he assumed that the noble lord did not intend to press his resolutions, for the time was not yet ripe for committing the House to any opinion. He was quite ready to admit that the existing state of the law was the cause of many difficulties in the position of married women; but great difference of opinion existed as to the means of meeting the difficulty. At the same time, he trusted that something practical might be done in the present session.

LORD CAMPBELL was ready at that moment to affirm that the law relating to married women ought to be reformed. In truth, its present state was barbarous. But from the proposition in favour of settlement by operation of law he entirely dissented, as he thought it would lead to constant domestic quarrels. He moved the adjournment of the debate to this day six weeks.

After a few words in reply from Lord Brougham, Lord Campbell's motion was agreed to.

Monday, Feb. 16.

JUDICIAL STATISTICS.

LORD BROUGHAM laid on the table a bill, the object of which was to facilitate the collection of judicial statistics. His lordship observed that the want of such statutes was greatly felt in this country, while all over the continent, and even in Naples, some provision was made for their collection. The bill he now presented was exceedingly short, and he hoped before the second reading the schedules which had undergone revision, correction, and improvement by the Law Amendment Society, would be perfected.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said that some account of the business done in the various courts would be very desirable. He thought the subject deserving of consideration.

LAW OF LIBEL.

LORD CAMPBELL presented a petition praying for an alteration of the law respecting the right of publishing *bona fide* reports of meetings in which speakers had stated matters which were slanderous. Their lordships were no doubt aware that a recent case (*Davidson v. Duncan*) had been heard and decided by him and his brethren, in which the publisher of a paper had been found liable in respect of a report in a newspaper of a meeting, at which meeting a speaker had used language amounting to a libel on a third party. But while as a judge he had given his judgment on the law, as a legislator it was his right to express his opinion as to what the law ought to be. He reminded their lordships that many years since he had introduced a measure for the protection of the press in respect to *bona fide* reports of debates in that or the other House. It certainly seemed to him a monstrous thing that the publisher of a paper should be mulcted for merely giving, with no malicious intention, a report of a statement made in that House. So far as the proceedings of the two Houses were concerned, he should at that moment consider most favourably any proposition similar to the measure which had formerly been introduced into Parliament. And with regard to public meetings, he was not prepared to say that the right of publication might not be advantageously extended under certain limitations and restrictions; but it was most preposterous to suppose that the judges sitting on the bench should seek to change the law of England. That he hoped they would never attempt to do. [See *infra*, Feb. 19.]

Tuesday, Feb. 17.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE STATUTES.

In reply to a question from Lord Brougham,

THE LORD CHANCELLOR said it was his intention at an early day in this or the following week to lay upon the table seven bills, forming a complete consolidation of criminal offences, which the Statute Law Commission had been engaged during the recess in preparing. Those bills had been prepared before the end of last session, and in their then state they were laid upon the table of the House, but they applied in part to England, and in part to England and Ireland; but it was found that, after they had been corrected by Irish lawyers, they would, thus altered, be but incongruous measures, and that it would be better to have two sets of bills. He proposed to lay those bills on the table, and then he would state in some detail exactly what had been done, and what was being done, by the commission.

Thursday, Feb. 19.

LAW OF LIBEL.

Lord CAMPBELL gave notice that on Thursday, 26th February, he would move for a select committee to inquire whether the privileges at present accorded to reports of proceedings in courts of justice might not be extended to reports of the proceedings in the two houses of Parliament; and whether, also, they might not be extended to reports of public meetings and assemblages; and, if so, under what restrictions.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, Feb. 13.

STATUTE LAW COMMISSION.

On a motion of Lord PALMERSTON, Mr. Baines, Sir J. Graham, Mr. Walpole, the Attorney-General, Sir F. Thesiger, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Henley, Mr. Hughes, Sir W. Heathcote, Sir F. Kelly, Lord Stanley, Mr. Locke King, Mr. Napier, Mr. Evelyn Denison, and Mr. W. Ewart were appointed a committee on the Statute Law Commission.

Monday, Feb. 16.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC JUSTICE.

Lord CASTLEROSSE appeared at the bar with the following message from her Majesty:—"I have received your address on the subject of the establishment of a department of public justice, and shall give directions that the subject shall receive the attentive consideration which its importance demands."

ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSION.

Sir G. GREY, in reply to a question of Lord R. CECIL, whether it was his intention to bring in any bill for the purpose of giving effect to recommendations of the committee which sat last session on the Ecclesiastical Commission, said that a bill upon the subject had been prepared, and on Monday next he would give notice of the day of its introduction.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

Mr. McMAHON asked whether the commission for inquiring into the Administration of Justice would make a report in time to found a measure thereon this session?

Sir G. GREY answered that the commission was now sitting, but he could not say when it would make its report.

EXPULSION OF JAMES SADLER.

Mr. FITZGERALD moved a resolution to the effect that Mr. James Sadler having been charged with frauds, and not having obeyed an order of the House commanding him to attend in his place on the 24th of July last, and being a fugitive from justice, should be expelled from the House.

Sir F. THESIGER approved of the resolution, but contended that the facts brought forward by Mr. Roebuck towards the close of last session were sufficient to have warranted his expulsion at that time.

Mr. ROEBUCK, Mr. WHITESIDE, Sir G. GREY, and other members having briefly spoken, the motion was agreed to.

Tuesday, Feb. 17.

PUBLIC PROSECUTOR.

Mr. J. G. PHILLIMORE rose to ask whether it was the intention of her Majesty's Ministers to bring forward any measure founded on the report of the committee of last session on the appointment of a public prosecutor.

The SOLICITOR-GENERAL said that the subject had been for some time under the consideration of Government. The question was one of the greatest difficulty, and the Government were not at present prepared to bring in a bill.

Wednesday, Feb. 18.

JUDGMENTS EXECUTION BILL.

Petitions in favour of the bill were presented from the Society of Mutual Communication for the Protection of Trade; The Bristol Chamber of Commerce; The Guardian Society of Liverpool; and on the 19th from the Guardian Society for the Protection of Trade, Glasgow.

Thursday, Feb. 19.

On the motion of Mr. CRAWFORD, that the House go into committee on this bill,

Mr. HUGHES moved to defer the committee for six months, on the ground, that the effect of this measure would be that a creditor having obtained an English judgment might, just before the expiration of the six years, send a memorandum to Ireland and have a right of execution during another six years in that country, although he could have no such remedy in the county where he had recovered.

Colonel FRENCH seconded the amendment.

Mr. HADFIELD supported the bill.

Mr. WHITESIDE said, that the law of judgments had been investigated by a committee a few months ago, and they stated in their report that the law of judgment in Ireland required to be reconsidered, but that recommendation had never been complied with. He would recommend the hon. and learned gentleman either to postpone his bill until the new department of justice was established, or to refer it to the Attorney-General for Ireland, who was bound to bring in a bill to remedy the law of judgments in Ireland in conformity with the recommendation of the select committee.

Mr. WARREN regarded the measure as one to secure the uniform administration of the law throughout the United Kingdom. A judgment was simply the deliberate declaration of the court that the plaintiff ought to recover a certain sum of money due to him by the defendant. That declaration could not be made behind the back of the defendant. The object of the bill was with industrious care to put a judgment of the courts of the three kingdoms on the same footing.

Mr. NAPIER said that his objection was, that the remedy was worse than the disease. By the first clause a judgment fifteen or twenty years old, which could not be enforced in the kingdom in which it was obtained, might be transferred by memorial to another kingdom, and execution issued upon it without any notice to the person affected by it. Again, if a person issued execution for more than the amount due to him, if he "overmarked" it, he was now liable to an action; but by this bill if a man "overmarked" an execution in Ireland, obtained by means of an English or Scotch judgment, the person against whom it was issued would have no remedy unless he took proceedings in England or Scotland. That difficulty had been felt by the select committee which sat on a bill upon this subject in 1854, and they had, therefore, confined the operation of that bill to judgments obtained in adverse suits. He suggested that wherever there had been an adjudication upon a demand, and the debtor was not resident in the kingdom where such adjudication had been obtained, a specified copy of the adjudication should be sent to the country in which the debtor resided, and an affidavit made of the amount due, upon which a judge should, if he thought proper, make an order, and that order by a recent law would become a rule of court.

Mr. ROEBUCK said there was no doubt that all laws in a civilised country similar to each other ought to have the same effect in every part of that country, but the bill was not founded upon that principle; on the contrary, it gave the same effect to different laws. The law of Scotland was that the court of session was the *commune forum* of all persons residing abroad, and they were summoned to it by citation at the Market-cross of Edinburgh, and at the pier and shore of Leith. When a man who resided abroad possessed only movable property in Scotland the process of "arrestment" was resorted to; a letter was directed to the supposed debtor and put into a box; he heard nothing of it; and if this bill became law, the first notice he would have of the proceedings would be, that some one would issue execution against him in London. To that execution he would have no answer.

The LORD-ADVOCATE said that the present bill merely carried into effect the principle unanimously recognised by the committee of 1854. Effect was given to a foreign judgment in every civilised country, and he thought the time had now come to make a judgment obtained in one of these three kingdoms available in the other two. The only question was whether they ought to continue to treat the three kingdoms as foreign kingdoms? He thought they ought not. The fact that actions were not very often brought upon English judgments in Irish courts proved that a measure of this kind was necessary, as creditors preferred losing their debts to bringing two or three separate actions for them.

Mr. SPOONER objected to the bill on the ground that it would open the door to fraud, by enabling dormant judgments to be put in force without notice.

The House divided, when the numbers were—for going into committee 127, against it 80, majority 47; the House accordingly resolved into committee.

Mr. H. HUGHES suggested that the present committee should be adjourned for a week, in order that hon. members having amendments should place them on the printed paper, and thus make the House acquainted with them before their consideration. Several amendments of the measure had been suggested to him by one of the Irish judges.

Mr. CRAWFORD acceded to the proposition.

After a brief discussion the House resumed, the committee having been postponed till another day.

Private Bills before Parliament.

SESSION, 1857.—LIST OF APPLICATIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS.

NAME OR SHORT TITLE FOR VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

Those Bills marked with an (*) are waiting for decision by the Select Committee on Standing Orders.

NAME OF BILL.	Petition presented.	Read 1st time.	Read 2nd time.	Report from Committee.	Bill as amended considered.	Read 3rd time.
1. Aberdeen Junction Ry.
2. Aberdeen, Peterhead, and Fraserburgh Railway ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 12	Feb. 16	ed by S. O. C. Committee
3. Aldershot Railway ...	Feb. 12	Feb. 16
4. Alva Parish ...	Feb. 13	Feb. 16
5. Andover Canal Sale ...	Feb. 6	Feb. 9
6. Atlantic Telegraph Co. ...	Feb. 10	Feb. 11	Feb. 16
7. Australian Agricultural Co. ...	Feb. 10	Feb. 11	Feb. 16
8. Backwater Bridge & Road. ...	Feb. 17	Feb. 19
9. Bagenalstown and Wexford Railway ...	Feb. 10	Feb. 11
10. Bank of London & National Provincial Ins. Ass. ...	Feb. 10	Feb. 12
11. Banff, Macduff, & Turriff Extension Railway ...	Feb. 16	Feb. 17
12. Banff, Portsoy, and Strathisla Railway ...	Feb. 12	Feb. 13	Feb. 18
13. Bathgate, Airdrie, & Coatbridge Railway ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
14. Bedale and Leyburn Ry. ...	Feb. 9	Feb. 10	Feb. 16
*15. Belfast Improvement ...	Feb. 12
16. Berkeley, Dursley, &c., Turnpike Trust. ...	Feb. 13	Feb. 18
17. Beasdaleigh Road ...	Feb. 13	Feb. 18
18. Birkenhead District Gas and Water
19. Birkenhead Docks (Construction) ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 11
20. Birkenhead Docks (Management) ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 11
21. Birkenhead, Lancashire, & Cheshire Junction, & Gt. Western Railway Cos. ...	Withd. rawn
22. Birkenhead, Lancashire, & Cheshire Junction Ry. ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
23. Blackburn Railway ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
24. Blyth and Tyne Railway ...	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11
25. Border Counties Railway ...	Struck off the list of Petitions
26. Bourne and Essendine Ry. ...	Feb. 16	Feb. 17
27. Bridgewater Markets and Fairs ...	Feb. 16	Feb. 17
28. Brighton, Hove, & Preston Constant Service Water. ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
29. Bristol, South Wales, and Southampton Union Ry. ...	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 13
30. British and Irish Grand Junction Railway ...	Feb. 18	Feb. 19
31. Briton Ferry Docks ...	Feb. 9	Feb. 10	Feb. 16
32. Burial of the Dead within the City and Liberties of London ...	Feb. 6	Feb. 9
33. Burslem and Tunstall Gas. ...	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11
34. Bury Gas ...	Feb. 11	Feb. 12	Feb. 17
35. Calcutta and South-Eastern Railway Company ...	Feb. 10	Feb. 11
36. Caledonian Railway (Lines to Granton) ...	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11
*37. Caledonian Railway (Running Powers) ...	Feb. 16
38. Cannock Mineral Ry. (No. 1) ...	Feb. 9	Feb. 10	Feb. 16
39. Cannock Mineral Railway (No. 2) ...	Feb. 16	Feb. 17
40. Cardigan Markets and Improvements ...	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	Feb. 16
41. Carlisle and Hawick Ry. ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
42. Carlisle, Liddisdale, and Hawick Railway ...	Withd. rawn
43. Charing-cross Bridge ...	Feb. 13	Feb. 16
44. Chatham District Water. ...	Feb. 12	Feb. 13	Feb. 18
45. Chepstow Gas ...	Feb. 13	Feb. 16
46. Chester Water ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 17
47. Clifton Railway
48. Clyde Navigation ...	Feb. 4
49. Colne and Bradford Ry.
50. Coniston Railway ...	Feb. 16	Feb. 18
51. Conway Valley Railway
52. Cork and Bandon Railway ...	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 12
53. Cork and Youghal Railway ...	Feb. 13	Feb. 16
54. Cork Consumers' Gas
55. Cork Gas ...	Feb. 9	Feb. 10	Feb. 16
56. Cornwall Railway ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
57. Cwm Amman Railway ...	Feb. 6	Feb. 9
58. Dartmouth & Torbay Ry. ...	Feb. 17	Feb. 19
*59. Deeside Extension Ry. ...	Feb. 17
60. Dexthorpe Turnpike Trust
61. Doncaster & Wakefield Ry. ...	Feb. 17	Feb. 18
62. Dorset Central Railway ...	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11
63. Dublin and Meath Railway
64. Dublin & Wicklow Ry. ...	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11
65. Dumbarton Water, &c. ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
*66. Dundalk & Enniskillen Ry. ...	Feb. 10
67. Eastern Bengal Ry. Co.
68. Eastern Counties Railway. ...	Feb. 4

NAME OF BILL.

NAME OF BILL.	Petition presented.	Read 1st time.	Read 2nd time.	Report from Committee.	Bill as amended considered.	Read 3rd time.
69. East Kent Railway (Extension to Dover) ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
70. East Kent Railway (Strood to St. Mary's Cray, &c.) ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 19
71. East Somerset Railway ...	Feb. 11	Feb. 12	Feb. 17
72. East Suffolk Railway ...	Feb. 19
73. Edinburgh, Perth, & Dundee, and Scottish Central Railway Companies. ...	Feb. 12	Feb. 16
74. Electric Telegraph Co. ...	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11
75. Elle Harbour ...	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	Feb. 16
76. Ely Tidal Harbour & Ry. ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
77. Ely Valley Railway ...	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11
78. European and Indian Junction Telegraph Co. ...	Feb. 16	Feb. 17
79. Exeter and Exmouth Ry. ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
80. Fife and Kinross Railway ...	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11
81. Finsbury Park ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 19
82. Fiskerton Drainage ...	Feb. 17	Feb. 18
83. Formartine & Buchan Ry. ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 12	...	ed by S. O. C. Committee
84. Forth & Clyde Junc. Ry. ...	Feb. 13	Feb. 16
85. Fownhope and Holme Lacy Bridge ...	Feb. 13	Feb. 16
*86. Fraserburgh Harbour ...	Feb. 6
87. Glasgow City & Suburban Gas ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
88. Glasgow Gas ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
89. Great Northern & Western of Ireland Railway ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 19
90. Great Southern & Western Extension Railway ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
91. Great Southern & Western Railway (Capital) ...	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11
92. Great Western and Brentford Railway ...	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11
93. Gt. Yarmouth Britannia Pier ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
94. Great Yarmouth Water ...	Feb. 10	Feb. 11	Feb. 16
95. Guildford Gas ...	Feb. 13	Feb. 16
96. Guildford Water ...	Feb. 13	Feb. 16
97. Hamilton & Strathaven Ry. ...	Feb. 13	Feb. 16
98. Hartlepool Extension and Headland Improvement ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 6	Feb. 11	Withd. rawn
99. Haslingden and Todmorden Roads ...	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	Feb. 16
100. Hereford Cathedral Restoration ...	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11	Withd. rawn
101. Herne Bay & Faversham Ry. ...	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	Feb. 16
102. Hull and Hornsea Ry.
103. Imp. Continental Gas Ass.
104. Inverness & Nairn Ry. ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
105. Ipswich Water ...	Feb. 18	Feb. 19
106. Islington Parish ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 19
*107. Keith & Dufftown Ry. ...	Feb. 12
108. Kildgrove Market ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
109. Kildgrove Market, Town Hall, &c. ...	Feb. 5	Feb. 9	Feb. 16
110. Kinross-shire Railway ...	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11
111. Lancaster and Carlisle and Ingleton Railway ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
112. Landport and Southsea Improvement ...	Feb. 9	Feb. 10	Feb. 16
113. Langport, Somerset, and Castle Cary Roads ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 9
114. Leslie Railway ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
115. Lewes & Uckfield Railway ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 11
116. Liverpool & Birkenhead Dks. ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 16
117. Liverpool Docks Committee and Birkenhead Docks
118. London (City) Coal Duties
119. London (City) Hotel and Building Company
120. London & South-Western Railway Acts Amendment ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
121. Lowestoft and Burgh St. Peter Ferry and Roads ...	Feb. 10	Feb. 12	Feb. 17
122. Lowestoft Water, Gas, and Market ...	Feb. 9	Feb. 10	Feb. 16
123. Mallow & Fermoy Railway ...	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11
124. Mansfield & Workshop Road ...	Feb. 10	Feb. 12	Feb. 17
125. Margate Water ...	Feb. 13	Feb. 16
126. Manchester Corporation ...	Feb. 16
*127. Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Ry. (Buxton and Cleethorpes) ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 16
128. Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway (Romsley, &c.) ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 16
129. Mayor's Court of the City of London ...	Feb. 6	Feb. 9
130. Medical, Legal, & General Mutual, & New Equitable Life Ass. Cos. Amalgam. ...	Feb. 12	Feb. 13	Feb. 18
131. Meriton's and Hagen's Sufferance Wharves ...	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	Feb. 16
132. Mersey Conservancy and Docks ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 11
133. Metropolitan Cattle Mkts. ...	Feb. 6	Feb. 9
134. Metropolitan New Streets and Improvements ...	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 11
135. Metropolitan Railway ...	Feb. 16	Feb. 19
136. Metropolitan Sewerage (Outfall to the Sea)

NAME OF BILL.	Petition presented.	Read 1st time.	Read 2nd time.	Report from Committee.	Bill as amended considered.	Read 3rd time.	NAME OF BILL.	Petition presented.	Read 1st time.	Read 2nd time.	Report from Committee.	Bill as amended considered.	Read 3rd time.
*137. Mid-Kent Ry., Bromley to St. Mary's Cray (Extension to Dartford)	Feb. 12	206. Stockport, Disley, & Whaley Bridge Railway	Feb. 4
138. Mid-Kent Ry. (Croydon Ex.)	Feb. 4	Feb. 19	207. Stratford-upon-Avon Gas	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
139. Mid-Kent & S. Kent Ry.	Feb. 13	Feb. 17	*208. Stratford-upon-Avon Ry.	Feb. 10
140. Midland & Gt. Western Ry. of Ireland (Sligo Extension)	Feb. 9	Feb. 10	Feb. 16	209. Sunderland Gas	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
141. Midland Gt. Western Ry. of Ireland (Tullamore Line)	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	Feb. 16	210. Sunken Vessels Recovery Company	Feb. 9	Feb. 10	Feb. 16
*142. Mid-Sussex Railway	Feb. 13	211. Swansea Docks	Feb. 18	Feb. 19
143. Milford Improvement	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	Feb. 16	212. Swansea Harbour Trust & Swansea Dock Company	Feb. 16
144. Monkland Railway	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11	213. Taff Vale Railway	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
145. Mordon Carrs Drainage	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	Feb. 16	214. Thames Embankments and Railways
146. National Assurance and Investment Association	Feb. 12	Feb. 13	Feb. 18	215. Thames & Medway Conserv.	Feb. 6	Feb. 9
147. Nene Valley Drainage and Navigation Improvement	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 13	216. Thames & Medway Ry.
148. New Brunswick & Canada Railway & Land Co.	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	Feb. 16	217. Tilbury, Maldon, and Colchester Railway	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 13
149. Newcastle-under-Lyme & Leek Roads	Feb. 9	Feb. 10	Feb. 16	218. Times, Athenæum, & Beacon Ass. Cos. Amalgam.	Feb. 13	Feb. 16
150. Newport, Abergavenny, & Hereford Railway	Feb. 17	Feb. 19	219. Tipperary Joint Stock Banking Company
*151. Newquay Pier, Harbour, and Railway	Feb. 10	220. Torquay & St. Mary Church Gas
152. New River Company	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10	221. Tottenham, Hornsey, and Willesden Junction Ry.
153. New Ross Free Bridge Act Amendment	222. Tralee and Killarney Ry.	Feb. 4	Feb. 6
154. Newry and Enniskillen Ry.	Feb. 4	223. Tweed Fisheries	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11
155. Newry, Warrenpoint, and Rostrevor Railway	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10	224. Tweed River Fisheries	Feb. 4	Feb. 6	Feb. 10
156. Newtown & Titchinethly Ry.	Feb. 13	Feb. 16	225. Tyne Improvement	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 13
157. Norfolk Estuary Acts Amendment	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11	226. Vale of Towry Railway
158. Norfolk Railway	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	227. Victoria Gas	Feb. 17	Feb. 19
159. North Derbyshire Railway	Withdrawn	228. Victoria (London) Docks	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
160. North-Eastern & Hartlepool Dock and Railway Cos. Amalgamation	Feb. 9	Feb. 10	Feb. 16	229. Watchet Harbour	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
161. North-Eastern Ry. (Capital)	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10	230. Watchet Harbour Trust	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
162. North-Eastern Ry. (Lancaster Valley Branch)	Feb. 4	Feb. 19	231. Waterford & Tramore Ry.	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
163. North Level Drainage	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 11	232. Wearmouth Bridge, Ferries and Approaches	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
164. North Staffordshire Ry. (Bridgewater Canals)	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11	233. Weaver Navigation	Feb. 9	Feb. 13
165. North-Western Railway	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11	234. West of Fife Mineral Ry.	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	Feb. 16
166. Norwich & Spalding Ry.	Feb. 10	Feb. 11	Feb. 16	235. West Hartlepool Harbour & Ry. and North-Eastern Ry. Cos. Amalgamation	Feb. 6	Feb. 10	Feb. 16
167. Oldham, Ashton-under-Lyne and Guide Bridge Junction Railways	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10	236. West London and Crystal Palace Railway
168. Orkney Roads	Feb. 17	Feb. 13	237. West Metropolitan Ry. & Thames Embankment
169. Otley and Skipton Road	Feb. 17	Feb. 19	238. Westminster Improvements	Feb. 12	Feb. 13
170. Peebles Railway	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10	239. Westminster Terminus Ry. Ex. (Clapham to Norwood Abandonment)	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	Feb. 16
171. Portadown and Dungannon Railway	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11	240. West Somerset Mineral Ry.	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
172. Portsmouth Railway	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11	*241. West Somerset Railway	Feb. 11
173. Portsmouth Water	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10	242. Wexford Free Bridge	Feb. 16	Feb. 18
174. Prestwich, Bury, and Radcliffe Roads	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	Feb. 16	243. Whitehaven and Furness Junction Railway	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
175. Prie's Patent Candle Co.	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10	244. Whitehaven, Cleator, and Egremont Railway	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10
176. Pulteney Town Harbour	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 13	245. Willenhall (Wolverhampton) Gas	Feb. 9	Feb. 10	Feb. 16
177. Reading Rys. Junction Ry.	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 11	246. Wilmslow & Lawton Road	Feb. 5	Feb. 6
178. Reversionary Interest Soc.	Feb. 11	Feb. 12	Feb. 17	247. Wimbledon & Dorking Ry.	Feb. 13	Feb. 16
*179. Rhymney Railway	Feb. 16	248. Workshop & Attercliffe Ry.	Feb. 10	Feb. 12	Feb. 17
180. Richmond Improvement	249. Wycombe Railway	Feb. 11	Feb. 12	Feb. 17
*181. Richmond & Kew Ex. Ry.	Feb. 17							
182. Ringwood, Christchurch, & Bournemouth Railway	Feb. 12	Feb. 13	Feb. 18							
183. St. George's Harbour Act Amendment							
184. St. Helen's Canal and Ry.	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	Feb. 16							
185. St. Philip's Church, Liverpool	Feb. 12	Feb. 13	Feb. 18							
186. Salford Borough (No. 1)							
187. Salford Borough (No. 2)	Feb. 10							
*188. Salisbury and Yeovil Ry.	Feb. 5	Feb. 6	Feb. 11							
189. Scottish Central Railway	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	Feb. 16							
190. Selby and Market Weighton Road	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	Feb. 16							
191. Shrewsbury Gas	Feb. 10	Feb. 11	Feb. 16							
192. Shropshire Union Rys. and Canal, London and North-Western Ry., and Shropshire Canal Companies	Feb. 17	Feb. 18							
193. Sittingbourne and Sheerness Railway	Feb. 4	Feb. 6	Feb. 11							
194. Slaney River Improvement	Feb. 16	Feb. 17							
195. Southampton, Bristol, and South Wales Railway	Feb. 4							
196. South Devon Railway	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10							
197. S.-Durham & Lanc. Un. Ry.	Feb. 4	Feb. 5	Feb. 10							
198. S. Eastern Ry. (Greenwich Junction to Dartford, &c.)	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	Feb. 16							
199. South-Eastern Ry. (Reading, &c.)	Feb. 10	Feb. 11	Feb. 16							
*200. South London Railway	Feb. 17							
201. South Shields Gas	Feb. 6	Feb. 9	Feb. 16							
202. South Staffordshire Water	Feb. 10	Feb. 11	Feb. 16							
*203. South Yorkshire & North Lincolnshire Junction Ry.	Feb. 13							
204. Stamford & Essendine Ry.	Feb. 13	Feb. 16							
205. Stockton New Gas & Stockton Gas Consumers' Cos.	Feb. 4	Feb. 6	Feb. 11							

Hartlepool Improvement.—Another bill has been ordered to be brought in, which in future lists will be styled (No. 2).

Solicitors must bear in mind that all petitions against bills must be presented not later than seven clear days after the date of the second reading.

The second reading of the following bills has been postponed to the dates set opposite to them—viz.

Burial of the Dead, &c.	until March 16.
Mayor's Court of City of London	Feb. 23
Metropolitan Cattle Market	March 16
Orkney Road	March 11

RAILWAY AND CANAL BILLS.

The Committee of Selection have nominated the following members to serve on the General Committee on Railway and Canal Bills:—

Mr. Hugh E. Adair.	Mr. G. A. Hamilton.
Mr. H. J. Baillie.	Sir Edmund Hayes.
Colonel Boldero.	Mr. Lascelles.
Major Bruce Cunningham.	Earl of March.
Mr. Cobbett.	Mr. Moody.
Mr. Corry.	Sir Erskine Perry.
Sir John Duckworth.	Sir William Somerville.
Sir James Buller East.	Mr. H. Ker Seymour.
Mr. Tatton Egerton.	Sir John Trollope.
Lord Robert Grosvenor.	Lord Harry Vane.

The Select Committee on Standing Orders met for the first time, for dispatch of business, on Tuesday, Feb. 17. The following is the result of their proceedings:—

1. *Edinburgh Life Assurance Society.*—Petition for leave to deposit a petition for Bill. Leave refused.
2. *East Kent Railway (Strood to St. Mary's Cray).*—Standing Orders dispensed with.
3. *Islington Parish.*—Standing Orders dispensed with.
4. *Fortmarn and Buchan Railway.*—Standing Orders not dispensed with.

5. *Mid Kent Railway (Croydon Extension)*.—Standing Orders dispensed with.
6. *Aberdeen, Peterhead, and Fraserburgh Railway*.—Standing Orders not dispensed with.
7. *Finsbury Park*.—Standing Orders dispensed with.
8. *Nevery and Enniskillen Railway*.—Bill allowed to proceed, on promoters inserting fresh notices for three weeks in country newspapers, and once in *Gazette*. Second reading to be deferred to 25th March.
9. *Southampton, Bristol, and South Wales Railway*.—Standing Orders dispensed with, on condition that the promoters insert fresh notices in *London Gazette*, and that second reading be deferred till 9th March.
10. *Stockport, Disney, and Whaley Bridge Railway*.—Standing Orders dispensed with, on condition that promoters strike out all provisions relating to Hayfield Extension.
11. *Eastern Counties Railway*.—Standing Orders dispensed with, on condition that promoters strike out all provisions relating to Railways Nos. 2 and 4. [No. 2 is a branch from Maldon Station to a junction with main line of the London, Tilbury, &c., Railway, at Pitsea. No. 4 is a railway from the secondly described railway, commencing in the parish of Rayleigh, and terminating in the parish of Canewdon.]
12. *Clyde Navigation*.—Standing Orders dispensed with, on condition that the promoters deposit amended plans and sections.

BILLS PETITIONED AGAINST.

The time has expired for petitioning against all Bills which were read a second time on the 10th and 11th of February. The following Bills were petitioned against:—

[EXPLANATION.—The first column shows the number of the Bill on the alphabetical list; the second column shows the number of petitions presented against it.]

No. of Bill on List.	No. of Petition.	No. of Bill on List.	No. of Petition.
13	1	134	1
19	16	144	1
20	12	152	1
22	6	155	2
23	6	157	18
24	10	161	1
28	4	163	13
33	3	164	11
36	8	165	4
41	4	167	1
62	1	171	1
65	1	172	7
69	1	173	3
76	2	177	3
77	2	197	1
80	3	205	3
87	2	207	1
88	2	209	1
90	2	213	17
92	2	223	2
108	4	224	3
110	6	228	1
111	1	229	2
114	1	230	2
115	1	232	1
120	8	240	1
132	8	243	1

N.B. The bills which were read a second time on the 10th or 11th February, and which do not appear in the above list, are unopposed, and will be referred to the Chairman of Ways and Means.

STANDING ORDER PROOFS.

Cases heard by the Examiners in respect of bills which have not been introduced into the House, up to February 19th.

[ABBREVIATIONS:—S. O. C., Standing Orders complied with. N. C., not complied with.]

Date.	NAME OF BILL.	Result.	Examiner.
Feb. 16	Great Yarmouth Water	{ Adjd. till Feb. 24	Mr. Smith
"	Eastern Bengal Railway Company	{ Adjd. till Mar. 26	"
"	Vale of Towry Railway	{ abandoned	"
"	Metropolitan Sewerage Outfall	{ Adjd. till Mar. 26	Mr. Frere
"	Tipperary Joint Stock Bank	{ Adjd. till Mar. 2	"
"	Hull and Hornsea Railway	{ List	"
"	Cork Consumers' Gas	{ Adjd. till Mar. 2	"
"	London City Coal Dues	{ Do.	"
"	West Metropolitan Railway	{ Adjd. till Mar. 5	"
17	Clifton Railway	{ withdrawn	Mr. Smith
"	New Ross Free Bridge	{ adjourned sine die	"
"	Liverpool Docks Committee	{ S. O. C.	"
"	Tottenham, Hornsey, & Willesden Ry.	{ withdrawn	"
"	Thames Embankment and Railway ...	{ adjd. till Feb. 27	"
"	Saint George's Harbour	{ Do.	"
"	Conway Valley Railway	{ adjd. till Feb. 26	Mr. Frere
"	Birkenhead District Gas and Water...	{ S. O. C.	"
"	Aberdeen Junction Railway	{ withdrawn	"
18	British and Irish Grand Junction Ry.	{ S. O. C.	"
"	Ipswich Water	{ " "	"
20	Thames and Medway Railway	{ adjd. for a month	"

Public Bill in the Nature of a Private Bill.

Feb. 19.—Chatham Lands S. O. C. Mr. Frere
The Examiners have now gone through the list of petitions deposited before the 1st January, with the exception of the adjourned cases.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON STANDING ORDERS—FRIDAY, FEB. 20.

Up to the time of going to press, the following cases had been decided by the Standing Order Committee. The reports will be published next week. The first seven Bills on the list were disposed of, and were allowed to proceed; the last case—viz., the Mid Kent Railway—was still under consideration when the reporter left.

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| 1. Fraserburgh Harbour. | 5. Dundalk and Enniskillen Rail. |
| 2. Salisbury and Yeovil Railway. | 6. West Somerset Railway. |
| 3. Newquay Pier, &c. | 7. Keth and Duftown Railway. |
| 4. Stratford-upon-Avon Railway. | 8. Mid Kent Railway (Bromley to St. Mary's Cray). |

In addition to the cases before enumerated, the following additional Bills have been sent to the Select Committee on Standing Orders—viz.,
Rhyney Valley Railway. Belfast Improvement.
Mid Sussex Railway. South London Railway.
Caledonian Railway (Running Desade Extension Railway.
Powers). Richmond and Kew Railway.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. Robert Palmer reported, from the General Committee of Elections, that they had selected the following six members to the Chairmen's Panel, and to serve as Chairmen of Committees for the present session:—

John Evelyn Denison, Esq. (Malton).
Edward Christopher Egerton, Esq. (Macclesfield).
George Alexander Hamilton, Esq. (Dublin University).
Robert Ingham, Esq. (South Shields).
Henry Ker Seymour, Esq. (Dorset).
The Right Hon. Sir Wm. Meredith Somerville (Canterbury).

RESOLUTION OF THE HOUSE OF LORDS—FEB. 17.

Petitions for Private Bills not to be received after Monday, 23rd March next, unless such Private Bill shall have been approved by the Court of Chancery; and no petition for a Private Bill approved by the Court of Chancery to be received after Tuesday, 19th day of May next; nor any report from the Judges after Tuesday, the 19th day of May next.

New County Court Rules.

SCHEDULE OF FORMS.

(Continued from p. 117.)

97. *Bond in Replevin under sect. 66 of 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108.*

Know all men by these presents that we A.B., of &c., C.D., of, &c., and E.F., of, &c., are held and firmly bound unto G.H. (* of, &c., in £ — to be paid to the said G.H. or his certain attorney, executors, administrators, or assigns, for which payment to be made we bind ourselves and each and every of us, in the whole, our and each of our heirs, executors, and administrators, jointly and severally firmly by these presents.

Sealed with our seals, and dated this — day of —, One thousand eight hundred and —.

Whereas the above-named C.D. and E.F., at the request of the said A.B., have agreed to enter into the above-written obligation, and this security has been approved of by —, the registrar of the County Court of —, holden at —, as appears by his allowance in the margin hereof:

Now the condition of this obligation is such, that if the above-bounden A.B. do and shall within one month from the date of the said obligation commence an action of replevin against the above-named G.H. in the County Court of —, holden at —, for taking and unjustly detaining of certain goods and chattels of the said — to wit [here insert the description of the goods and chattels], and prosecute such action with effect and without delay, and do and shall also make return of the said goods and chattels, if return thereof shall be awarded, then this obligation shall be void and of no effect, otherwise shall be and remain in full force.

A.B. (I.s.)
C.D. (I.s.)
E.F. (I.s.)

Signed, sealed, and delivered by the above-bounden in the presence of —.

I approve of this bond.

I.K., Registrar.

(This bond does not require a stamp.)

NOTE.—If a Deposit of Money be made, the Memorandum thereof should follow the terms of the condition of the Bond, and will not require a stamp.

(*) The distrainer.

98. Warrant to High Bailiff to replevy.

County Court of —, holden at —.
(Seal.)

Whereas: — hath given security as well to commence his action of replevin against — for the taking and unjustly detaining certain goods and chattels [or cattle] of the said —, that is to say — and prosecute such action with effect and without delay, as also to return the said goods and chattels, if return thereof shall be adjudged by law. Now, as registrar of the said County Court, and by virtue of the provisions of the Statute 19 & 20 Vict. c. 108, I hereby authorise and direct you without delay to replevy and deliver the said goods and chattels [or cattle] to the said —, and forthwith to return to me this warrant and what you shall have done under the same.

Dated the — day of — 185—.

—, Registrar of the Court.

To the High Bailiff of the Court.

In obedience to this warrant, I have replevied and caused to be delivered to the within named —, the within-mentioned goods and chattels [or cattle].

Dated this — day of —, 185—.

—, High Bailiff.

(For Judgment for Plaintiff in Replevin, see Form 45.)

99. Judgment for Defendant in Replevin for Rent (Rule 180).

No. —. In the County Court of —, holden at —.
(Seal.)

Between A.B., Plaintiff, and C.D., Defendant.

Upon hearing this cause at a Court holden this day, it is adjudged that the plaintiff do return to the defendant the goods and chattels [or cattle, stating the particulars thereof], and pay to the registrar of the Court, forthwith [or on the — day of —], the sum of £— for costs of suit [or, It is adjudged that the amount due for rent in arrear from the plaintiff to the defendant is £—], and that the goods and chattels [or cattle] were of the value of £—, and that the plaintiff do forthwith [or on the — day of —] pay to the registrar of the Court, at his office, the said sum of £—, and also the sum of £— for costs of suit].

Given under the seal of the Court, this — day of —, 185—.

By the Court,

—, Registrar of the Court.

Hours of attendance at the office of the registrar [place of office] from ten till four, except on [here insert the day on which the office will be closed], when the office will be closed at one.

100. Judgment for Defendant in Replevin of Cattle Damage *feasant* (Rule 181).

No. —. In the County Court of —, holden at —.
(Seal.)

Between A.B., Plaintiff, and C.D., Defendant.

Upon hearing this cause at a Court holden this day, it is adjudged that the plaintiff do return to the defendant the cattle [here specify the cattle], or do pay to the registrar of this Court, forthwith [or on the — day of —], the sum of £—, which is now adjudged to be the amount of damage sustained by the defendant.

It is also adjudged that the plaintiff do pay to the registrar of the Court, on the day and year aforesaid, the sum of £— for costs.

Given under the seal of the Court, this — day of —, 185—.

By the Court,

—, Registrar of the Court.

Hours of attendance at the office of the registrar [place of office] from ten till four, except on [here insert the day on which the office will be closed], when the office will be closed at one.

101. Judgment in Detinue.

No. —. In the County Court of — holden at —.
(Seal.)

Between A.B., Plaintiff, and C.D., Defendant.

Upon hearing this cause at a Court holden this day it is adjudged that the plaintiff do recover against the defendant the sum of £—, the same being now this day assessed by this Court to be the value of the following chattels of the plaintiff wrongfully detained by the defendant; that is to say [here enumerate the chattels which the Court decides to have been detained], and the further sum of £— for damages for the detention of the said chattels, and the sum of £— for costs; and it is ordered that the defendant do pay the said several sums to the registrar of the Court on the — day of — 18—.

* And it is further ordered that if the defendant shall, on or before the said last-mentioned day, pay to the registrar the said sums respectively above ordered to be paid for damages and costs, and also return to the plaintiff the said chattels; and if the plaintiff shall then accept the same, then satisfaction of this judgment shall be entered up by the registrar on the production to him of a receipt for the said chattels signed by the plaintiff or his attorney or agent into Court.

Acknowledgment of Payment
into Court.

Date	£	s.	d.	Received by

Given under the seal of the Court, this — day of —, 185—

By the Court,

—, Registrar of the Court.

Hours of attendance at the office of the registrar [place of office] from ten till four, except on [here insert the day on which the office will be closed], when the office will be closed at one.

102. Warrant of Execution in Detinue against Goods of Defendant.

No. of Plaintiff —. No. of Warrant —.

In the County Court of —, holden at —.

(Seal.)

Between A. B. Plaintiff, and C. D. Defendant.

Whereas, at a Court holden at —, on the — day of —, 185—, the plaintiff obtained a judgment against the defendant for the sum of £—, the same being assessed by this Court to be the value of certain chattels of the plaintiff wrongfully detained by the defendant, and for the further payment of £— for damages for the detention of the said chattels, and of £— for costs; and thereupon it was ordered by the Court that the defendant should pay the same to the registrar of this Court on the — day of — [or by instalments of — for every — days, the first instalment to be paid on the — day of —, 185—]: *And it was further ordered, that if the defendant should, on or before the said last-mentioned day, pay to the registrar the said sums respectively above ordered to be paid for damages and costs, and also return to the plaintiff the said chattels; and if the plaintiff should then accept the same, then satisfaction of the said judgment should be entered up by the registrar on the production to him of a receipt for the said chattels signed by the plaintiff, or his attorney: *And whereas †the defendant did not on the said — day of — 18—, return the said chattels to the plaintiff, and †default has "also" been made in payment according to the said orders: These are therefore to require and order you forthwith to make and levy by distress and sale of the goods and chattels of the defendant wheresoever they may be found within the district of this Court (except the wearing apparel and bedding of him or his family, and the tools and implements of his trade, if any, to the value of five pounds), the sum stated at the foot of this warrant, being the amount due to the plaintiff under the said order, including the costs of this execution; and also to seize and take any money or bank notes (whether of the Bank of England or of any other bank), and any cheques, bills of exchange, promissory notes, bonds, specialties, or securities for money of the defendant, which may there be found, or such part or so much thereof as may be sufficient to satisfy this execution and the costs of making and executing the same, and to pay what you shall have so levied to the registrar of this Court, and to make return of what you have done under this warrant immediately upon the execution thereof.

N.B.—If the judgment do not contain the words between asterisks, omit those words in the warrant, and also the words between the marks (†) and (†), and the word "also."

Given under the seal of the Court this — day of —, 185—.

By the Court,

—, Registrar of the Court.

To the High Bailiff of the said Court, and
others the Bailiffs thereof.

* This paragraph is not to be added unless it be part of the order of the judge.

	£	s.	d.
Value of goods detained			
Damages for their detention			
Costs			
Paid into Court			
Remaining due			
Poundage for issuing this warrant			
Total amount to be levied			

NOTICE.—The goods and chattels are not to be sold until after the end of five days next following the day on which they were seized, unless they be of a perishable nature, or at the request of the defendant.

Application was made to the registrar for this warrant at — minutes past the hour of —, in the noon of the — day of —, 185—.

103. Summons under the Friendly Societies and other Acts (Rule 186.)

No. of Plaintiff —. In the County Court of —, holden at —. (Seal.)

Between A.B., Plaintiff (Address, Description), and C.D., Defendant (Address, Description, adding thereto the title of the office in the society as the holder of which he is summoned, and the name of the society.)

You are hereby summoned to appear at a Court to be holden at —, on the — day of —, 185—, at the hour of —, in the — noon, to answer the plaintiff in the matter the particulars of which are hereunto annexed.

Dated the — day of —, 185—.

—, Registrar of the Court.

To the Defendant.

Summonses for witnesses and for the production of documents will be issued upon application at the office of the registrar.

Hours of attendance at the office of the registrar [place of office] from ten till four, except on [here insert the day on which the office will be closed], when the office will be closed at one.

104. Order under the Friendly Societies and other Acts (Rule 186.)

No. —. In the County Court of — holden at —. (Seal.)

Between A.B., Plaintiff, and C.D., Defendant.

Upon hearing this cause at a Court this day holden it is ordered that the defendant do [here insert the terms of the order made by the Court].

And it is further ordered, that if the defendant do not obey the terms of the said order, he shall pay to the registrar of this Court, on or before the — day of — the sum of — by way of penalty, and the sum of £— for costs.

Given under the seal of the Court, this — day of —, 185—.

By the Court.

—, Registrar of the Court.

Hours of attendance at the office of the registrar [place of office] from ten till four, except on [here insert the day on which the office will be closed] when the office will be closed at one.

05. Order for Warrant of Execution to issue under the Friendly Societies and other Acts (Rule 186.)

No. of Plaintiff —. In the County Court of —, holden at —.

Between A.B., Plaintiff, and C.D., Defendant.

Whereas at a Court holden at —, on the — day of —, 185—, it was ordered by the said Court that [here insert the terms of the order of the Court]:

And it was then further ordered, that if the defendant should not obey the terms of such order, that he should pay to the registrar of the Court, on or before the — day of —, the sum of — pounds by way of penalty:

And whereas it appears to the Court that the defendant has not obeyed either of the said orders, although demand in that behalf was duly made upon him:

It is therefore ordered that a warrant of execution issue for the said sum, being the amount of such penalty, and the costs thereof.

Given under the seal of the Court, this — day of —, 185—.

By the Court.

—, Registrar of the Court.

Hours of attendance at the office of the registrar [place of office] from ten till four, except on [here insert the day on which the office will be closed] when the office will be closed at one.

106. Warrant Execution against the Goods under the Friendly Societies and other Acts (Rule 186.)

No. of Plaintiff —. No. of Warrant —. In the County Court of —, holden at —. (Seal.)

Between A.B., Plaintiff, and C.D., Defendant.

Whereas at a Court holden at — on the — day of —, 185—, it was ordered by the said Court that [here insert the terms of the order of the Court]:

And it was then further ordered, that if the defendant should not obey the terms of such order that he should pay to the registrar of the Court, on or before the — day of —, 185—, the sum of — pounds by way of penalty, and costs:

And whereas the defendant has not obeyed either of the said orders: These are therefore to require and order you forthwith to make and levy, by distress and sale of the goods and chattels of the defendant wheresoever they may be found within the district of this Court (excepting the wearing apparel and bedding of the defendant or his family, and the tools and implements of his trade, if any, to the value of five pounds), the sum stated at the foot of this warrant, being the amount of such penalty and costs including the costs of this execution, and also to seize and take any money or bank notes (whether of the Bank of England or of any other bank), and any cheques, bills of exchange, promissory notes, bonds, specialties, or securities for money of the defendant which may there be found, or such part or so much thereof as may be sufficient to satisfy this execution, and the costs of making and executing the same, and to pay what you shall have so levied to the registrar of the Court, and make return of what you have done under this warrant immediately upon the execution thereof.

Given under the seal of the Court this — day of —, 185—.

By the Court,

—, Registrar of the Court.

To the High Bailiff of the said Court, and others the Bailiffs thereof.

	£	s.	d.
Amount ordered to be paid			
Costs			
Poundage for issuing this warrant			
Total amount to be levied			

NOTICE.—The goods and chattels are not to be sold until after the end of five days next following the day on which they were seized, unless they be of a perishable nature, or at the request of the said defendant.

Application was made to the registrar for this warrant at — minutes past the hour of — in the — noon of the — day of —, 185—.

107. Warrant of Commitment for Contempt.

In the County Court of —, holden at —.

(Seal.)

To the High Bailiff and others the Bailiffs of the said Court, and all Peace Officers within the jurisdiction of the said Court, and to the Governor or Keeper of the [prison used by the Court].

Whereas at a Court holden on this day A.B. wilfully insulted the Judge during his sitting in Court [or C.D., the Registrar, High Bailiff, Bailiff, or Officer (as the case may be) of the said Court, during his attendance in Court, or wilfully interrupted the proceedings of the said Court, or wilfully misbehaved in the said Court]:

These are therefore to require you, the said High Bailiff, Bailiffs, and others, to take the said A.B. and to deliver him to the Governor [or Keeper] of the above-named prison, and you the said Governor [or Keeper, &c.] to receive the said A.B., and him safely to keep in the said prison for — days from the arrest under this warrant, or until he shall be sooner discharged by due course of law.

Given under the seal of the Court, this — day of —, 185—.

—, Judge of the Court.

108. High Bailiff's Warrant to Registrar of Foreign Court (9 & 10 Vict. c. 95, s. 104.)

No. of Plaintiff —. No. of Warrant —.

In the County Court of —, holden at —.

Between A.B., Plaintiff, and C.D., Defendant.

Whereas the warrant of execution [or commitment] hereto annexed has been issued out of this Court against the goods and chattels of —. And whereas the goods and chattels of —, out of the ordinary jurisdiction of this Court, and are [or is] believed to be within the jurisdiction of the County Court

of —, holden at —, of which you are the registrar: These are therefore to require you to cause the said warrant to be executed within the ordinary jurisdiction of the said last-mentioned County Court.

Dated this — day of —, 185—.

High Bailiff of the County Court of —, holden at —.
To the Registrar of the County Court of —, holden at —.

109. Order under 19 & 20 Vict. c. 97, s. 2.

No. —. In the County Court of —, holden at —.
(Seal.)

Between A.B., Plaintiff, and C.D., Defendant.

Upon hearing this cause (the same being for breach of contract to deliver specific goods for a price in money), at a Court holden this day, it being adjudged that the plaintiff is entitled to recover, it is, upon the application of the plaintiff, found and adjudged, that the goods in respect of the non-delivery of which the plaintiff is entitled to recover, and which remain undelivered, are as follows (that is to say), [here enumerate the goods undelivered]; and that the plaintiff would have been liable to pay the sum of £— [here insert the sum to be paid by plaintiff for the delivery] for the delivery thereof; and that the plaintiff will have sustained damages to the amount of £— [here insert the sum assessed for damages if the goods be delivered] if the said goods shall be delivered under execution as herein-after mentioned, and to the amount of £— [here insert the sum assessed for damages in the event of the non-delivery of the goods] if the said goods shall not be so delivered: And thereupon judgment being now given for the plaintiff, it is, upon the application of the plaintiff, ordered, that the said goods be delivered by defendant to the plaintiff, on the payment by him of the said sum of £— [here insert the sum to be paid by plaintiff for the delivery] on or before the — day of — now next ensuing, and that in default thereof execution do issue for the delivery to the plaintiff, on payment by the plaintiff of the said sum of £— [here insert the sum to be paid by plaintiff for the delivery] of the said goods; and that the defendant shall not have the option of retaining the same upon payment of the damages lastly assessed in the event of the non-delivery of the goods; and that the plaintiff do recover against the defendant the said sum of £— [here insert the sum assessed for damages if the goods be delivered] for damages and £— for costs: And it is further ordered, that if the said goods or any part thereof cannot be found within the district of this Court, the bailiff of this Court shall distrain the defendant by all his lands and chattels within the district of this Court till the defendant deliver the said goods, or, at the option of the plaintiff, the said bailiff shall cause to be made of the defendant's goods the said sum secondly above assessed for damages, or a due proportion thereof.

(To be continued.)

Court Papers.

Queen's Bench.

The following regulations for transacting the business at the Judges' Chambers will be strictly observed till further notice:—
Acknowledgments of deeds will be taken at half-past 10 o'clock.

Original summonses to be placed on the file.

Summonses adjourned by the judge will be heard at 11 o'clock.

Summonses of the day will be called and numbered at a quarter-past 11 o'clock, and heard consecutively.

The parties on two summonses only will be allowed to attend in the judge's room at the same time.

All long orders to be left, that they may be ready on being applied for the following day.

Counsel will be heard at half-past 1 o'clock. The name of the cause in which counsel are engaged to be put on the counsel file.

Affidavits in support of *Ex parte* applications for judge's orders (except those for orders to hold to bail) to be left the day before the orders are to be applied for, except under special circumstances; such affidavits to be properly endorsed with the names of the parties, the nature of the application, and the names of the attorneys.

All affidavits produced before the judge to be properly endorsed, and filed.

Exchequer of Pleas.

Sittings at Nisi Prius in Middlesex and London, before the Right Hon. Sir FREDERICK POLLOCK, Knight, Lord Chief Baron of her Majesty's Court of Exchequer, in and after EASTER TERM, 1857.

IN TERM.

In Middlesex.

1st Sitting	Thursday	April 16.
2nd Sitting	Friday	April 24.
3rd Sitting	Friday	May 1.

In London.

1st Sitting	Wednesday	April 22.
2nd Sitting	Wednesday	April 29.

AFTER TERM.

In Middlesex.

Saturday May 9.

In London.

Wednesday May 13.

The Court will sit during and after Term at Ten o'clock.

The Court will sit in Middlesex, at Nisi Prius, in Term, by adjournment from day to day until the causes entered for the respective Middlesex sittings are disposed of.

In each of the London sittings, during Term, there will be two days for the trial of causes.

Births, Marriages, and Deaths.

BIRTHS.

CLARKE—On Feb. 18, at 30 Kidare-terrace, Bayswater, the wife of Samuel Thomas Clarke, Esq., of a daughter.

ROWE—On Jan. 14, at the Lodge, Kandy, the wife of Sir William Carpenter Rowe, Chief Justice of Ceylon, of a son.

WALFORD—On Feb. 12, at Abergavenny, Monmouthshire, the wife of John Berry Walford, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a son.

DEATHS.

HAWLEY—On Feb. 13, Mary, wife of John Hawley, solicitor, at 2, Pembroke Cottages south, Pembroke-square, Kensington, and 8 Coleman-street, city.

JACOBS—On Feb. 10, at 41 Norland-square, Notting-hill, of bronchitis, Hugh Tooke, younger surviving son of Mr. William Jacobs, solicitor, aged 2 years.

PALEY—On Feb. 17, at Peterborough, John Hewitt Paley, solicitor, aged 26.

SHADWELL—On Jan. 11, at 10 Blandford-square, Regent's-park, Charles Shadwell, of Gray's-inn, Esq., brother to the late Right Hon. Sir Lancaster Shadwell, Vice-Chancellor of England, aged 75.

WOODGATE—On Feb. 13, Hamilton, eldest son of William Woodgate, Esq., solicitor, of Swaylands, Pembrokeshire, and Lincoln's-inn-fields, aged 21.

WRIGHT—On Feb. 17, at Upper Gower-street, Edith Pemberton, the daughter of Thomas Cooke Wright, Esq., of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, aged one year.

Unclaimed Stock in the Bank of England.

The Amount of Stock heretofore standing in the following names will be transferred to the Parties claiming the same, unless other Claimants appear within Three Months.

BLUNT, JOSEPH, sen., of Lincoln's-inn, Esq., £271: 15 Consols, claimed by his executors, JOSEPH BLUNT, JAMES CLAY, & CHARLES WALTON.
BOLLARD, WILLIAM PROCTOR, of the Middle Temple, Esq., £33: 6: 8 Consols, claimed by WILLIAM PROCTOR BOLLARD.

CLIFTON, JOHN HILL, Bedwardine, Worcestershire, gent., and WILLIAM SPURRIER, Birmingham, gent., £22: 17: 4 Consols, claimed by the survivor, JOHN HILL CLIFTON.

DUFFA, BALDWIN FRANCIS, of Lincoln's-inn, Esq., SAMUEL HENRY JEBB, Boston, Lincolnshire, Esq., and HELEN TURBETT, Ogston Hall, Morton, Derbyshire, spinster, £208: 8: 1 Consols, claimed by the survivor, SAMUEL HENRY JEBB.

EAMER, JOHN HARMAN, of the Stock Exchange, and THOMAS GLOVER KENSIT, of Skinner's Hall, London, gent., £201: 14: 8 3 per Cent Reduced, claimed by the survivor, THOMAS GLOVER KENSIT.

FOYSTER, REV. HENRY SAMUEL, Amersham, Bucks, £100 Consols, claimed by REV. HENRY SAMUEL FOYSTER.

FULLER, LADY MIRANDA, Bryansstone-sq., widow, GEORGE FULLER & RICHARD FULLER, Moorgate-sq., Bankers, £150 Consols, claimed by the survivor, LADY MIRANDA FULLER.

GREGORY, JOHN SWARBRECK, Bedford-row, gent., £51: 9: 1 New 3 per Cents, late £3: 5 per Cents, claimed by JOHN SWARBRECK GREGORY.

KEENE, BENJAMIN, Charles-st., Berkeley-sq., Esq., £157: 13: 3 Consols, claimed by his executors, REV. CHARLES EDMUND RUCK KEENE, Sir EDWARD BLACKETT, & EDWARD THOMPSON.

LEAR, REV. FRANCIS, Chilmark, Wilts, clerk, and ISABELLA MARY LEAR, his wife, £1,049: 0: 3 and £911: 13: 4 Reduced Consols, claimed by the survivor, ISABELLA MARY LEAR.

LLOYD, REV. MATRICE HEDD, Godmeston, Kent, £35: 19 New 3 per Cents, claimed by his sole executrix, FRANCES ELIZABETH LLOYD, spinster.

MIDDLEMISS, ALEXANDER, Kenwood, Middlesex, gent., £300: 7: 1 Consols, claimed by ALEXANDER MIDDLEMISS.

MOUNT EDGCOMBE, Right Hon. RICHARD Earl of, £746: 17: 6 Consols, claimed by his surviving executors, the Right Hon. ERNEST AUGUSTUS, Earl of MOUNT EDGCOMBE, and DEBBIE BOGGE.

RANKEN, CHARLES, of Gray's-inn, Middlesex, gent., ARTHUR HYDE, No-hill, Leitrim, Ireland, clerk, PARSONS CROFTON, Metton-st., Dublin, Esq., and WILLIAM HENRY CONNER, Lieut. R.N., £301: 5: 3 New 3 per Cents, claimed by CHARLES RANKEN, ARTHUR HYDE, PARSONS CROFTON, & WILLIAM HENRY CONNER.

TOD, EWIN MONTEITH, Morning-side, Edinburgh, gent., £55: 3: 6 Consols, claimed by EWIN MONTEITH TOD.

TOD, SUTTONUS MACDONALD, Morning-side, Edinburgh, gent., £35: 0: 5 Consols, claimed by SUTTONUS MACDONALD TOD.

WILTS, JOHN, Keppell-sq., Russell-sq., Esq., £65 Consols, claimed by the said JOHN WILTS.

WOODWARD, RICHARD, Clifton, Gloucestershire, Esq., £330: 18: 1 Consols, claimed by the said RICHARD WOODWARD.

YOUNGHUBBARD, THOMAS, Jersey, gent., £100 New 3 per Cents, claimed by THOMAS YOUNGHUBBARD.

Next of Kin.

Advertised for during the Week.

TAYLOR, WILLIAM (who died on Jan. 5, 1849), Cordwalner, late of Louth, in Lincolnshire. The legal personal representatives (except Amy Dobbs and the testator's cousin Timothy Green, and their respective children), to communicate with Ingridy & Bell, Solicitors, Louth.

TOWNS, JOHN (who died at Charlton Kings, Gloucestershire, in 1822). Next of kin to communicate with Mr. Thomas Lowe, Charlton Kings, or Mr. James Yeend, Shackle's Pike, Cheltenham, the executors.

DEWELL, THOMAS (who died in Feb. 1825), Gosport. Next of kin or their representatives to come in and prove their kindred on or before Mar. 10, at V. C. Kindersley's Chambers.

OSBALDESTON, JOHN (who died in Dec. 1822), Worsley, Lancaster. His heirs at law, next of kin, or their representatives, and the real and personal representatives of his nephew or niece, Joseph Hewitt and Mary his wife, John Wheedall and Alice his wife, and Adam Osbaldeston, and Eleanor Barnes, to come in and prove their claims on or before April 16, at the office of District Registrar, 4 Norfolk-st., Manchester.

Money Market.

CITY, FRIDAY EVENING.

At the close of last week, and also on Monday, the English Funds were depressed and inactive. There has, subsequently, been more animation, and a recovery of $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; but the advance of last week has not been fully maintained. The withdrawal of gold from the Bank of England has not been large. There is no alteration in the rate of discount, but the Bank authorities have decided to make advances in anticipation of the April dividends at 6 per cent., being $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. lower than previously, and money is in better supply in the discount market and on the Stock Exchange.

From the Bank of England return for the week ending the 14th instant, which we give below, it appears that the amount of Notes in circulation is £18,796,415, shewing a decrease of £76,790, and the stock of Bullion in both departments is £10,259,660, shewing an increase of £280,414, when compared with the previous return.

Quotations of the French 3 per Cents. on the Paris Bourse show an advance of 1 per Cent. during the week, and discount is freely obtained in Paris below the rate of the Bank of France, the Emperor's speech at the opening of the French Legislature having imparted a feeling of confidence. Other important foreign securities are steady at a small advance on the prices of last week. It is announced that the concession by the Russian Government of the great net-work of railways is settled. The lines are to be constructed within ten years, at an outlay of about £45,000,000. Messrs. Baring, Brothers, and Co. are concerned for England. The Russian Government guarantees 5 per Cent. on the outlay.

It is imputed to the Government by many persons, particularly by Mr. Clay, in his speech at Hull, that having fixed their estimates for the Army and Navy, on a scale requiring a considerable amount of Income-tax, above 7d. in the pound, the pressure of public opinion, adverse to the War Income-tax, has induced them to make a reduction of three or four millions or more below the first estimates proposed. If it be true that Lord Palmerston's Government is very ready to yield to the influence mentioned by Mr. Clay, and to run before the gale of popular impulse, the probability of such line of policy is likely to have led to the conclusion that it has been adopted. Such an impression on the public mind must tend to destroy confidence in the Government; but those who examine the scale of taxation as by law now established for the three ensuing years, and compare it with the scale proposed for adoption by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in the House of Commons, will find no such large amount of difference as to make any considerable alteration in the estimates necessary. The Income-tax, under the existing law, would amount to 26d. in the pound in the three years. The modification proposed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer being 7d. in the pound yearly, for three years, will amount to 21d. in the pound. The estimated difference of amount in the three years is £5,000,000, which the proposed alteration in the duty on Tea and Sugar is expected to reduce to £4,000,000. It is clear that this last amount of deficiency, spread over three years, cannot have made necessary any such humiliating and dangerous change of policy as is imputed to the Government in regard to the estimates for the Army and Navy. Parties interested in the sale of Tea view the proposed alteration in the duty with regret, as effecting existing contracts, and a Stock of 97,000,000 lbs. It appears this view will have the advantage of Mr. Gladstone's support, according to the resolution of which he has given notice for to-night.

The returns of the Board of Trade, for the last year, were issued on Thursday, shewing in the declared value of the Exports of the United Kingdom an excess over 1855 of £20,202,772. The largest increase is in metals, the second in cotton, and the third in woollen manufactures. Under the head of imports, the increase in wheat and flour is remarkably large—

being in wheat two-thirds more, and in flour and meal double the quantity imported in 1855. The wheat and flour taken for home consumption in the last year amount to 4,107,941 quarters of wheat, and 4,038,242 cwt. of flour and meal. In wine and spirits the quantities taken for home consumption are larger than in the year 1855.

The remarkable fertility of the Danubian Principalities, and the abundant supply of grain, which may thence be drawn through the Ports of Galatz and Ibrail, make the question of their future administration interesting to commercial men. The French Government appears to desire that the provinces should be united, and placed under the government of a foreign prince with the title of King. As this resembles very much the policy which placed King Otho on the throne of Greece, it naturally suggests the view of a fresh field for Russian influence. It is said that the majority of the people in Moldavia and Wallachia desire to be united. If this be so, some other bond of union than the shadow of a king may after a time be found, and under the influence of a prosperous course of development, we may see the united provinces in the east rival in industry and wealth the historical fame of the united provinces of the Netherlands. Moreover, the suzerainty of Turkey which is guaranteed by the Treaty of Paris, may press less heavily than the crushing influence of Russia, and allow the great fertility of those provinces more free development. And thus the manufactures of England will find profitable returns to a vastly increasing extent in the ports of the estuary of the Danube. The policy of Russia to monopolize at Odessa, the trade of all the provinces which lie on the northern side of the Euxine, will sustain an important check. On these grounds England, Austria, and Turkey are opposed to the union so prematurely advocated by France.

English Funds.

ENGLISH FUNDS.	Sat.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thur.	Fri.
Bank Stock	217½	216½	219 18	...	218½	...
3 per Cent. Red. Ann.	94½	93½	95½	94½	94½	94
3 per Cent. Cons. Ann.	93½	93½	93½	93½	93½	93½
New 3 per Cent. Ann.	94½	94½	94½	94½	94½	94½
New 2½ per Cent. Ann.	73
5 per Cent. Annuities	113½
Omnia
3½ per Cent. Annuities
Long Annuities (exp. Jan. 5, 1860)	2½	2½	2½	...
Do. 30 yrs. (exp. Oct. 10, 1859)
Do. 30 yrs. (exp. Jan. 5, 1860)
Do. 30 yrs. (exp. April 5, 1865)	18 5-16	18½
India Stock	219	220 1	220 1	...	220	221½
India Bonds (£1,000)	2s. dis.	...	2s. dis.	2s. dis.	...
Do. (under £1,000)	1s. dis.	2s. dis.	...
Exch. Bills (£1,000)	1s. pm.	...	3s. pm.	2s. pm.	...	8s. pm.
Exch. Bills (£500)	4s. pm.	3s. pm.	3s. pm.	...	4s. pm.	4s. pm.
Exch. Bills (Small)	3s. pm.	1s. pm.	3s. pm.	1s. pm.	1s. pm.	4s. pm.
Exch. Bonds, 1858, 3½ per Cent.	98½	98½	98½
Exch. Bonds, 1859, 3½ per Cent.	98½	...	98½	...	98½	98½

Railway Stock.

Railways.	Sat.	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thur.	Fri.
Bristol and Exeter ...	94½	95	94
Caledonian ...	64½	64½	63½	66	66½	66½
Chester and Holyhead ...	36½
East Anglian	19	19	19½	...
Eastern Union Stock ...	42	43	42½	...
East Lancashire
Edinburgh and Glasgow	57½	...	57
Edin., Perth, & Dundee ...	35	35	35½
Glasgow & South Western	93
Great Northern ...	93½	93½	93½	93	93	93
Gr. South & West. (Ire.)	112½	...
Great Western ...	68½	68½	68½	68½	68½	68½
Lancashire & Yorkshire ...	99½	99½	99½	99½	99½	99½
Lon., Brighton, & S. Coast ...	108½	108½	108½	108½	109 8½	...
London & North Western ...	107½	107½	107½	107½	108 7½	108½
London and S. Western ...	105½	105½	105	105½	105½	105 3d
Man., Shef., and Lincoln ...	36½	36½	35 6 5½	36 5½	35½	36
Midland	83½	83½	83½	83½	83½
Norfolk	55½	...	55½	...	55½
North British ...	41	41½	41½	42 1½	42½	43½
North Eastern (Berwick) ...	87 7	87 7	86½	87½	88	88½
North London	28	28½	28
Oxford, Worc. & Wolv.	27	26½	27
Scottish Central
Scot. N.E. Aberdeen Stock ...	27	26½	...	27	26½	27
Shropshire Union	30	50
South-Eastern ...	76½	76	...	76½	75½	76½
South-Wales ...	85½	86½	85½	85

Bank of England.

AN ACCOUNT, PURSUANT TO THE ACT 7TH AND 8TH VICTORIA, C. 32, FOR THE WEEK ENDING ON SATURDAY, THE 14TH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1857.

ISSUE DEPARTMENT.

£	£
Notes issued . . . 24,054,270	Government Debt . . . 11,015,100
	Other Securities . . . 3,459,900
	Gold Coin and Bullion . . . 9,579,270
	Silver Bullion . . . —
£24,054,270	£24,054,270

BANKING DEPARTMENT.

£	£
Proprietors' Capital . . . 14,553,000	Government Securities . . . —
Res . . . 3,925,742	(Incl. Dead Weight)
Public Deposits (including Exchequer, Savings Banks, Commissioners of National Debt, and Dividend Accounts) . . . 7,087,607	Annuity . . . 11,545,000
Other Deposits . . . 9,774,058	Other Securities . . . 18,247,794
Seven day & other Bills . . . 790,641	Notes . . . 5,257,855
£35,731,048	Gold and Silver Coin . . . 680,390
	£35,731,048

Dated the 19th day of Feb., 1857.

M. MARSHALL, Chief Cashier.

London Gazettes.

NEW MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

TUESDAY, Feb. 17, 1857.

County of Rut.—The Right Hon. James Stuart Wortley, her Majesty's Solicitor-General.

Borough of Downpatrick.—Richard Ker, Esq., vice the Hon. Charles Stewart Hardinge, now Viscount Hardinge, summoned to the House of Peers.

City of Hereford.—George Clive, of Cavendish-square, in the county of Middlesex, Esq., vice Sir Robert Price, Bart., who has accepted the office of steward or bailiff of her Majesty's Manor of Northstead, Yorkshire.

FRIDAY, Feb. 20, 1857.

Borough of Bandon Bridge.—Captain the Hon. William Smyth Bernard, of the Farm, near Bandon, vice The Hon. Francis Bernard (commonly called Viscount Bernard), now Earl of Bandon.

Borough of Clonmel.—John Bagwell, Esq., of Marfield, Tipperary, vice John O'Connell, Esq., who has accepted the office of Clerk of the Crown and Hanaper in Ireland.

County of Lincol.—The Right Hon. William Monsell, President of the General Board of Health.

Bankrupts.

TUESDAY, Feb. 17, 1857.

BARNETT, THOMAS, Butcher, Ironbridge, Salop. Mar. 4 and 23, at 10.30; Birmingham. *Com. Balguy. Off. Ass. Bittleston. Sol. Knight, Birmingham. Pet. Feb. 13.*

BLACKMORE, ALFRED, Hosier, 89 High-st., Shoreditch. March 4, at 12, and April 6, at 2; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Off. Ass. Nicholson. Sols. Linklater & Hackwood, 17 Sise-lane. Pet. Feb. 17.*

BUTT, THOMAS, Ironmonger, Littlehampton, Sussex. Feb. 26 and April 3, at 12; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fane. Off. Ass. Cannan. Sols. J. & J. H. Linklater & Hackwood, 17 Sise-lane, Bucklersbury. Pet. Feb. 16.*

CAMPIN, HENRY, Warehouseman, 67 Watling-street. Feb. 27, at 12.30, and April 7, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Holroyd. Off. Ass. Lee. Sols. Reed, Langford, & Marsden, 99 Friday-st., Cheapside. Pet. Feb. 17.*

FERNELL, RICHARD, Commission Agent, 22 Aldermanbury. Feb. 27, at 11, and Mar. 26, at 2; Basinghall-st. *Com. Evans. Off. Ass. Bell. Sols. Venning & Naylor, Tokenhouse-yard. Pet. Feb. 6.*

FOSCOLO, PETER GEORGE (P. G. Foscolo & Co.), Corn Merchant, 3 Danster-court, Mining-lane. Feb. 26, at 11, and April 2, at 12; Basinghall-st. *Com. Evans. Off. Ass. Bell. Sols. Lawrence, Plewa, & Boyer, Old Jewry-chambers. Pet. Feb. 16.*

INGERSANT, GEORGE, Licensed Victualler, Mall Tavern, The Mall, Notting-hill. Feb. 27, at 1.30, and April 3, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. Off. Ass. Stanfield. Sols. Graue, Son, & Feasenmeyer, 23 Bedford-row. Pet. Feb. 11.*

MASCALL, JOSEPH, Grocer, Wolverhampton, Staffordsh. Feb. 28 and March 21, at 11.30; Birmingham. *Com. Balguy. Off. Ass. Bittleston. Sols. Kitson, Wolverhampton; Finlay Knight, Birmingham. Pet. Feb. 14.*

NEVINS, ALEXANDER ALOOCK, Merchant, Liverpool. Mar. 3 and April 6, at 11; Liverpool. *Com. Perry. Off. Ass. Cazenove. Sols. Evans & Sons, Commerce-st., Liverpool. Pet. Feb. 14.*

RAYMOND, THOMAS FOWLER (T. F. Raymond & Co.), Commission Merchant, Liverpool. Mar. 2 and April 6, at 11; Liverpool. *Com. Perry. Off. Ass. Cazenove. Sol. Booker, Liverpool. Pet. Feb. 6.*

ROBINSON, WILLIAM, Licensed Victualler, Milnthorpe, Haversham-with-Milnthorpe, Westmoreland. Feb. 26 and March 26, at 12; Newcastle-upon-Tyne. *Com. Ellison. Off. Ass. Baker. Sols. Wilson, Kendal; or Hoyle, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Pet. Feb. 4.*

SANKLEY, JOSEPH, Wheelwright, Salford, Lancashire. March 2 and 23, at 12; Manchester. *Off. Ass. Pott. Sols. Vickers & Diggle, 1 Cooper-st., Manchester. Pet. Feb. 16.*

SMITH, JOHN, Corn Dealer, Staplehurst, Kent.—Erratum in Gazette of Feb. 13, for Mar. 7 read April 7.

WALKER, JAMES, Bridle Cutter and Innkeeper, Walsall, Staffordshire. Feb. 21 and Mar. 21, at 11.30; Birmingham. *Com. Balguy. Off. Ass. Christie. Sol. Finlay Knight, Birmingham. Pet. Feb. 12.*

WANE, WILLIAM ATTEWELL, Grocer, Highworth, Wilts. Mar. 2 and 31, at 11; Bristol. *Com. Hill. Off. Ass. Miller. Sols. Browne, Swindon; or Priddleaux, Bristol. Pet. Feb. 6.*

WATTS, JAMES, Innholder, Norton Saint Philips, Somersetsh.—Erratum in Gazette of Feb. 13, for Sol. Selwood read Sol. Miller, Frome Selwood.

FRIDAY, Feb. 20, 1857.

BAKER, WILLIAM, Clock Maker, 38 & 39 Birchall-st., Birmingham. March 5 & April 2, at 11.30; Birmingham. *Com. Balguy. Off. Ass. Whitmore. Sol. Baldwin, Birmingham. Pet. Feb. 17.*

BALDWIN, EDWARD, Printer and Newspaper Proprietor, Shoe-lane. March 5, at 11.30, & April 2, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Evans. Off. Ass. Johnson. Sols. Barker, Bowker, & Peake, 1 Gray's-inn-sq. Pet. Feb. 18.*

BASSE, JAMES, & SOLOMON LINDO (James Basse & Co.), Wine and Spirit Merchants, 4, Savage-garden, Tower-hill. *Com. Goulburn. Off. Ass. Nicholson. Sols. Lawrence, Smith, and Fawdon, 12 Broad-st. Pet. Feb. 19.*

BASNETT, JAMES, & THOMAS BASNETT, Opticians, Liverpool. March 4 & April 8, at 11; Liverpool. *Com. Perry. Off. Ass. Morgan. Sols. Hiatt, Wellington, Salop; or Evans & Son, Commerce-st., Liverpool. Pet. Feb. 11.*

CHALCROFT, JOHN, 4 Norfolk-rd., Westbourne-grove North. March 6, at 12, & April 6, at 11; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Off. Ass. Nicholson. Sols. Lawrence, Smith, and Fawdon, 12 Broad-st., Cheapside. Pet. Feb. 9.*

COLLISON, HENRY WILLIAM, JUN., Provision Merchant, Bath. March 3 & April 6, at 11; Bristol. *Com. Hill. Off. Ass. Acraman. Sol. Gibbs, Bath. Pet. Feb. 16.*

COWAN, JAMES, Cheesemonger, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. March 4, at 11, & April 7, at 12; Newcastle-upon-Tyne. *Com. Ellison. Off. Ass. Baker. Sols. Watson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; or Harwood, 10 Clement's-lane, Lombard-st. Pet. Feb. 18.*

CHARLES, ROBERT RUMNEY, & WILLIAM FORDICE, Paper Manufacturers, Haughton, Northumberland. March 6, at 11, & April 8, at 12; Newcastle-upon-Tyne. *Com. Ellison. Off. Ass. Baker. Sols. Bell, Broderick, and Bell, Bow Church-yard; or Head & Son, Hexham. Pet. Feb. 3.*

GARNETT, HENRY, Stationer, 34 & 35 Stroud-st., Dover. March 3, at 2.30, & March 31, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Holroyd. Off. Ass. Edwards. Sol. Chidley, 10 Basinghall-st. Pet. Feb. 17.*

GILLAM, JOHN, 14 Devon-st., Strand, & WILLIAM HENRY TAYLER, 20 City-rd., and 15 Poultry, Licensed Victuallers. Mar. 4, at 2, and April 1, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. Off. Ass. Graham. Sols. King & George, 35 King-st., Cheapside. Pet. Feb. 14.*

HENDERSON, GEORGE, Apothecary, 7 Stanhope-ter., Regent's-pk. Mar. 5, at 1.30, and April 4, at 12; Basinghall-st. *Com. Evans. Off. Ass. Johnson. Sol. Chidley, Basinghall-st. Pet. Feb. 19.*

HILL, JAMES BRECH, Glass and China Dealer, 254 Blackfriars-rd. Mar. 2, at 12, and April 6, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Off. Ass. Fennell. Sol. Cordwell, 22 College-hill, City. Pet. Feb. 13.*

HUDSON, THOMAS, Ship Broker, Liverpool. Mar. 3, & April 7, at 11; Liverpool. *Com. Perry. Off. Ass. Cazenove. Sol. Chilton, Liverpool. Pet. Feb. 19.*

JONES, THOMAS (in copartnership with Stephen Noakes), Ale, Beer, and Bottle Merchant, 6 New Broad-st., and 73 Back Church-lane, St. George's-in-the-East. Mar. 3 and 31, at 2; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. Off. Ass. Graham. Sol. Chidley, 10 Basinghall-st. Pet. Feb. 18.*

LEE, ROBERT, Currier, Cromford, Derbyshire. Mar. 10 and 31, at 10.30; Nottingham. *Com. Balguy. Off. Ass. Harris. Sols. Smith, Derby; or Kieve, Birmingham. Pet. Feb. 13.*

MORRIS, EDWARD JOSEPH, Wine and Spirit Dealer, Malpas, Cheshire. Mar. 3, and April 6, at 11; Liverpool. *Com. Perry. Off. Ass. Morgan. Sols. Etches, Whitechurch, Salop; or Tyrer, Liverpool. Pet. Feb. 16.*

OLIVER, ANN, Grocer, Widow, Walsington, Yorkshire. Mar. 4, and April 1, at 12; Kingston-upon-Hull. *Com. Ayrton. Off. Ass. Carrick. Sols. Robinson & Atkinson, Beverley and Hull. Pet. Feb. 7.*

POTTER, SAMUEL, Livery-stable Keeper, High-st., Marylebone. Feb. 27, and April 3, at 12; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fane. Off. Ass. Cannan. Sol. May, Bolton-house, Russell-sq. Pet. Feb. 13.*

STEFFANO, PETER, Ship Chandler, 28 Welbeck-sq., and Cardiff. Mar. 6, at 1, and April 4, at 12; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fane. Off. Ass. Whitmore. Sols. Williamson, Hill, & Williamson, 10 Great James-st., Bedford-row. Pet. Feb. 18.*

TRUSCOTT, JAMES, Commission Agent, 10 Austin Friars. Mar. 3, at 11.30, and Mar. 31, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. Off. Ass. Stanfield. Sol. Wyatt, 4 Verulam-bldgs. Pet. Feb. 18.*

WESTON, JOHN, Manufacturing Chemist, Mottram, Longdendale, Cheshire. Mar. 3 and 30, at 12; Manchester. *Off. Ass. Fraser. Sols. Hewitt & Needham, Bond-st., Manchester. Pet. Feb. 17.*

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

TUESDAY, Feb. 17, 1857.

GRAVENOR, WILLIAM THOMAS, Hatter, Birmingham. Feb. 12.

THALASSO, EPIFANIO, Merchant, 11 Bury-st., St. Mary-axe. Jan. 9.

MEETINGS.

TUESDAY, Feb. 17, 1857.

BARNES, ROBERT YALLOWLEY, Floor Cloth Manufacturer, 14 City-rd. Mar. 11, at 11; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Dir.*

BARTON, JOHN, & GEORGE BARTON (John Barton & Co.), Copper Roller Manufacturers, Broughton, Manchester. Mar. 16, at 12; Manchester. *Com. Jemmett. Dir. joint est. of G. Barton.*

BRADLEY, SAMUEL, Corn and Malt Factor, 82 Mark-la. Mar. 10, at 2; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. Second Dir.*

BRADSHAW, EDWARD THOMAS, Dealer in Bricks and Timber, Manchester. Mar. 10, at 12; Manchester. *Com. Jemmett. Dir.*

BROADBENT, WILLIAM HENRY, & WILLIAM HUDSON, Builders, Nottingham. Mar. 10, at 10.30; Nottingham. *Com. Balguy. Dir.*

BYERS, MICHAEL, & THOMAS BYERS (Michael Byers & Co.), Ship Builders, Monkwearmouth Shores, Sunderland. Mar. 11, at 11, 11.30, and 12.30; Newcastle-upon-Tyne. *Com. Ellison. First Dir. joint and sep. est.*

CHAMBERLAIN, GEORGE, JUN., Lead Merchant, 90 Crawford-st., St. Marylebone. Mar. 12, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Evans. Last Est.*

GODDARD, EDMUND, Provision Dealer, 103 London-wall, 3 Old Jewry, 161 Fenchurch-st., and 17 Aldgate. Mar. 11, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. Dir.*

GUTTERIDGE, JAMES, Horse Dealer, Elizabeth-st., Eaton-sq. Mar. 11, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Dic.*
 HYDE, JOHN, Spindle Maker, Stockport, Cheshire. Mar. 11, at 12; Manchester. *Com. Jemmett. Dic.*
 LORD, SIMON, & EDWARD LORD, Millwrights, Bacup, Lancashire. Mar. 11, at 12; Manchester. *Com. Jemmett. Dic.*
 M'GREGOR, DONALD, Travelling Dealer, 28 Bedford-st., Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Lancashire. Mar. 19, at 12; Manchester. *Com. Skirrow. Dic.*
 MULLIGAN, JOHN, Draper, 10 Sidney-st., Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Lancashire. Mar. 20, at 12; Manchester. *Com. Skirrow. Dic.*
 POOLE, ANN SOPHIA, Pawnbroker, 26 Bridge-rd., Lambeth, now of 27 Gt. Suffolk-st., Southwark. Mar. 10, at 1.30; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. Dic.*
 PRIESTLEY, SAMUEL, Grocer, Accrington, Lancashire (in copartnership with James Whittaker & John Ellison, Ironfounders and Millwrights, Church, near Accrington). Mar. 11, at 12; Manchester. *Com. Jemmett. Dic.*
 PRUDHOE, ROBERT, Grocer, Durham. Mar. 12, at 12; Newcastle-upon-Tyne. *Com. Ellison. Dic.*
 RICHARDSON, JOHN, Jun., Common Brewer, Cockermouth. Mar. 10, at 11; Newcastle-upon-Tyne. *Com. Ellison. Further Dic.*
 RIDGWAY, JOHN (John Ridgway & Co.), Merchant, Liverpool. Mar. 12, at 11; Liverpool. *Com. Stevenson. Dic.*
 STERS, MORRIS ROBERTS, JAMES WALKER, & DANIEL BACKHOUSE SYERS (Syers, Walker, & Co.), Merchants, Bell-alley, Lombard-st.; and at Liverpool, under style of Syers, Walker, & Syers. Mar. 11, at 11.30; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Dic.*
 VONDER HETDE, JOHN JAMES & CHRISTOPHER OCTAVUS VONDER HEYDE, Tobacco Manufacturers, 80 Lower Thames-st. Mar. 10, at 2; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. Dic. sep. est. of J. J. Vonder Heyde.*
 WENDEN, WILLIAM, Cattle Dealer, Great Bromley, Essex. Mar. 6, at 11; Basinghall-st. *Com. Evans. Last Ex.*
 WOODS, SAMUEL, Builder, Weybridge, Surrey. Mar. 11, at 1.30; Basinghall-st. *Com. Goulburn. Dic.*

FRIDAY, Feb. 20, 1857.

AMER, STEPHEN, Grocer, Bradford, Yorkshire. Mar. 24, at 11; Leeds. *Com. Ayrton. Dic.*
 BOYD, FRANCIS, Grocer, Tynemouth. Mar. 6, at 11.30; Newcastle-upon-Tyne. *Com. Ellison. By adj. Last Ex. and Mar. 19, at 1; Dic.*
 CHAMBERLAIN, GEORGE, Jun., Lead Merchant, 90 Crawford-st., St. Marylebone. Mar. 12, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Evans. Last Ex.*
 CLAUDE, JOHN GEORGE, Merchant, Liverpool. Mar. 13, at 11; Liverpool. *Com. Stevenson. Dic.*
 DAVIS, CHARLES HENRY, Builder, New Cross-rd., Deptford. Mar. 3, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. By adj. Last Ex.*
 ELTEEN, JOSEPH, Grocer and Cheesemonger, High-st., Kensington. Mar. 14, at 11.30; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fane. Dic.*
 FARREBROTHER, FRANK BRADSHURST, GEORGE WILLIAM BREMYER, & JOSEPH HENRY COLLIVER (Farrebrotther, Bremyer, & Co.), Wax, Spirits, and Oil Merchants, Stockwell and Manchester. Mar. 21, at 12; Basinghall-st. *Com. Holroyd. Dic.*
 GRIFFIN, JAMES, Pontiler, Liverpool. Mar. 17, at 11; Liverpool. *Com. Perry. Dic.*
 RUSSELL, WILLIAM HUGH, Blacking Manufacturer, 30 Strand. Mar. 13, at 12; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fane. Dic.*
 SAUL, ROBERT, & THOMAS KIRBY, Joiners, Preston. Mar. 26, at 1; Manchester. *Com. Skirrow. Dic.*
 LOHE, CHARLES YAX, Woollen Warehouseman, 6 Bread-st. Mar. 13, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Holroyd. Dic.*
 WELLS, THOMAS, Grocer, 34 Dorset-pl., Clapham-rd. Mar. 3, at 1.30; Basinghall-st. *Com. Fonblanque. By adj. Last Ex.*
 WOOD, EDWARD, Worsted Spinner, Bingley, Yorkshire. Mar. 24, at 11; Leeds. *Com. Holroyd. First and Final Dic.*
 YOUNG, WILLIAM OGSTON, Ship and Insurance Broker, 4 Sun-court, Cornhill, 54 Cross-st., Manchester, and 19 Dale-st., Liverpool. Mar. 13, at 1; Basinghall-st. *Com. Holroyd. Dic.*

DIVIDENDS.

TUESDAY, Feb. 17, 1857.

COOKE, WILLIAM, Miller, Albert-ter., Bow (late of St. Thomas Mill). Second, 3½d., on new profits. *Stansfeld, 10 Basinghall-st., any Thursday, 11 & 2.*
 CROLE, WILLIAM, Jun., Merchant, Rood-la. First, 3s. 2d. *Stansfeld, 10 Basinghall-st., any Thursday, 11 & 2.*
 DAVIES, JOHN, Printer, Shrewsbury. Div. 1½d. *Bittleston, Waterloo-st., Birmingham, Feb. 12, or two following alternate Thursdays, 11 & 3.*
 DUNCAN, WILLIAM, & THOMAS HAMPER, Hop Merchants, 31 Tooley-st., Southwark. First, 5s. *Stansfeld, 10 Basinghall-st., any Thursday, 11 & 2.*
 GARSTANG, WILLIAM, & THOMAS GARSTANG, Coal Dealers, Wigan. First, 3s. 2d. *Herrnman, 69 Princess-st., Manchester, any Tuesday, 10 & 1.*
 HAWKE, WILLIAM, Builder, Great Queen-st. First, 2s. *Lee, 20 Aldermanbury, Feb. 18, and three subsequent Wednesdays, 11 & 2.*
 JOHNSON, JOHN, Ironmonger, Bourn, Lincolnshire. First, 3s. 6d. *Harris, Middle-pavement, Nottingham, Feb. 16, or three following Mondays, 11 & 3.*
 KEELING, WILLIAM, (W. Keeling & Co.), Brickmakers, Birmingham. Second, 1½d. *Bittleston, 29 Waterloo-st., Birmingham, Feb. 12, or two following alternate Thursdays, 11 & 3.*
 LAY, THOMAS, Hop Merchant, Wolverhampton. First, 2s. 6½d. *Christie, 37 Waterloo-st., Birmingham, any Thursday, 11 & 3.*
 MASON, WILLIAM HENRY GOODRICH, Publisher, 108 King's-rd., Brighton. First, 1s. *Stansfeld, 10 Basinghall-st., any Thursday, 11 & 2.*
 PALMER, GEORGE JOSIAH, Printer, Savoy-st., Strand. First, 3s. 10d. *Lee, 20 Aldermanbury, Feb. 18, and three subsequent Wednesdays, 11 & 2.*
 RIDGE, BENJAMIN, Apothecary, Putney. First, 1s. 4d. *Stansfeld, 10 Basinghall-st., any Thursday, 11 & 2.*
 THOMPSON, CHARLES ROBERT, Wine Merchant, Winchester-house, Old Broad-st., and Southampton. First, 3d. *Stansfeld, 10 Basinghall-st., any Thursday, 11 & 2.*
 TRAVIS, JOSEPH, Woollen Manufacturer, Newchurch, Lancashire. Second, 1d. *Herrnman, 69 Princess-st., Manchester, any Tuesday, 10 & 1.*
 WINTERHEAD, JOSEPH, Coach Builder, Bradford, Yorkshire. First and final div., 11s. 2d. *Hope, 1 South-parade, Park-row, Leeds, any Friday, 11 & 1.*

FRIDAY, Feb. 20, 1857.

CONQUEST, JOHN, Money Scrivener, Moorgate-st. Second, 5s. 8d. *Graham, 25 Coleman-st., Thursday next, and three following Thursdays, 11 & 2.*
 GASKIN, WILLIAM, Builder, Croydon. First, 1s. 1½d. *Graham, 25 Coleman-st., Thursday next, and three following Thursdays, 11 & 2.*
 HITT, THOMAS, Currier, Castle-st., Exeter. First, 3s. 9d. *Hirtzel, Queen-st., Exeter, any Tuesday or Friday, 11 & 2.*
 LANGDON, JAMES HENRY, Merchant, Exeter. First, 2s. 3½d. *Hirtzel, Queen-st., Exeter, any Tuesday or Friday, 11 & 2.*
 LING, JAMES, Money Seller, Taunton. First, 6s. *Hirtzel, Queen-st., Exeter, any Tuesday or Friday, 11 & 2.*
 LOWLE, FRANCIS, & HENRY GARDNER, Manufacturers, Wellington, Somersetshire. First, 6s. 5d. *Hirtzel, Queen-st., Exeter, any Tuesday or Friday, 11 & 2.*
 SEARELL, ALLEN, Miller, Furgeley Mill, Ashburton, Devon. First, 4s. 6d. *Hirtzel, Queen-st., Exeter, any Tuesday or Friday, 11 & 2.*
 SHEPPARD, THOMAS MATTHEW, Corn and Coal Merchant, Cambridge. First, 4s. 1½d. *Graham, 25 Coleman-st., Thursday next, and three following Thursdays, 11 & 2.*

CERTIFICATES.

TUESDAY, Feb. 17, 1857.

BROWN, CHARLES, Milliner, 42 Oxford-st. Mar. 10, at 12; Basinghall-st.
 DANBY, GEORGE, Wine Merchant, Watford, Herts. Mar. 11, at 1; Basinghall-st.
 DOUGHTY, JOHN, Builder and Auctioneer, Castle Donnington, Leicester-shire. Mar. 24, at 10.30; Nottingham.
 ELLIOTT, NATHANIEL, Dealer in Cigars, 4 Old Millgate-chambers, Manchester. Mar. 12, at 1; Manchester.
 HARTZ, WILLIAM (Hartz & Co.), Merchant, Mark-lane, and Fenchurch-st. Mar. 11, at 1; Basinghall-st.
 LEWIS, MOSS ALFRED, & JACOB LEWIS (M. A. Lewis & Co.), Lithographic Printers, 121 Fore-st., Cripplegate. Mar. 11, at 12; Basinghall-st.
 ROSE, HARRIS, Milliner, Lynn, Norfolk. Mar. 11, at 2; Basinghall-st.
 STIRROE, ROBERT JUKES, Currier, Ironbridge, Salop. Mar. 12, at 10; Birmingham.

FRIDAY, Feb. 20, 1857.

ADAMSON, ROBERT HENRY, Wine and Spirit Merchant, 14 John-st., Berkeley-sq. Mar. 14, at 11.30; Basinghall-st.
 ALLTIE, JOHN, Tailor, Liverpool. Mar. 13, at 11; Liverpool.
 BAYLEY, SAMUEL, Grazier, Wednesbury, Stafford. Mar. 16, at 10.30; Birmingham.
 BERRY, JOHN, RICHARD BERRY, & THOMAS BERRY, Machinists, Rochdale, on application of J. Berry and T. Berry. Mar. 13, at 1; Manchester.
 FREUND, JONAS CHARLES HERMAN, Boarding-house Keeper, 7 West-st., Finsbury. Mar. 13, at 1; Basinghall-st.
 HAWKINS, HENRY JONATHAN, Licensed Victualler, 1 Midway-ter., Lower-rd., Rotherhithe. Mar. 16, at 11; Basinghall-st.
 HAWORTH, JOHN, Spinner, Shaw Clough, Rossendale. March 13, at 2; Manchester.
 REYNOLDS, JOSEPH JAMES, Mining and Share Broker, 21 Threadneedle-st. Mar. 14, at 11.30; Basinghall-st.
 RING, WILLIAM, Ham and Beef Shop, 29 Paddington, St. Marylebone. March 13, at 12; Basinghall-st.
 SMITH, WILLIAM, Builder, Halesowen, Worcestershire. April 16, at 10; Birmingham.
 USTWICK, JOHN, Baker, Seacombe, Chester. March 13, at 11; Liverpool.
 WATSON, THOMAS, Mining Agent, 2 Artillery-pl., Finsbury-sq.; JAMES ENSOR, Dealer in Mining and other Shares, 3 Copthall-blds., Throgmorton-st. March 14, at 12; Basinghall-st.

To be DELIVERED, unless APPEAL be duly entered.

BUCKLEY, DAVID, Builder, Birmingham. Feb. 12, 2nd class.
 HODDER, EDWIN JOHN, Grocer, Birmingham. Feb. 9, 2nd class.
 IRISH, MARMADUKE, Licensed Victualler, White Hart Inn, Maidenhead. Feb. 10, 2nd class.
 LEDWARD, GEORGE. Feb. 2, 3rd class.
 PARR, JOHN, Woollen draper, Wolverhampton. Feb. 9, 2nd class.
 PEPPER, WILLIAM JOHN, Printer, Coventry. Feb. 9, 2nd class.
 SEAWARD, FRANCIS, Licensed Carman, 2 Abchurch-yd., Abchurch-lane. Feb. 11, 2nd class.

FRIDAY, Feb. 20, 1857.

BARFOOT, JOHN, Cattle Salesman, North Stoneham. Feb. 14, 2nd Class.
 INMAN, HENRY, Shopkeeper, Bradford. Feb. 16, 3rd Class.
 LEICESTER, CHAMNEY, & JOHN EILES LITTLEBOY, Corn Merchants, Liverpool. Feb. 9, 2nd Class, to J. E. Littleboy, to be suspended for two years from Feb. 9, 1857, with protection.
 LOSE, JAMES EDWARD, Builder, Crickwood. Feb. 13, 3rd Class.
 SCOTT, JAMES, Rag Merchant, Batley Carr. Feb. 17, 3rd Class.
 THOMAS, OWEN, Tailor, Manchester. Feb. 11, 3rd Class.
 VAYRO, JOHN, Linendrapier, Ripon. Feb. 17, 3rd Class.
 WOOD, EDWARD, Worsted Spinner, Bingley. Feb. 16, 3rd Class, to be suspended for 12 mos.

Insolvents.

PETITIONS to be heard at the COURT HOUSE, PORTUGAL-STREET.

FRIDAY, Feb. 13, 1857.

BARTHOROPPE, GEORGE EDWARD (sued as George E. Barthoroppe, detained as George C. Barthoroppe), Professor of Elocution, 15 Melbourne-sq., Brixton-rd. Mar. 2, at 11; *Com. Law.*
 BRIDGE, JAMES, sen., Launderer, 3 St. George's-villas, Latimer-rd., Shepherd's-bush. Mar. 2, at 11; *Com. Phillips.*
 JEFFERSON, CHARLES, Chandler's-shop-keeper, 27 King-st., Ramsgate. Feb. 28, at 11; *Com. Phillips.*
 JEFFORD, EDWARD COOK, Lodging-house-keeper, 35 Welldclose-ay., St. George's-in-the-East. Feb. 28, at 11; *Com. Phillips.*
 LEVY, LOUIS (known as Lewis Levy), Tailor, 21 Langley-pl., Commercial-rd. East. Feb. 27, at 11; *Com. Law.*
 PALMER, JOHN, Bellhanger, 67 Myddleton-st., Clerkenwell. Feb. 27, at 11; *Com. Law.*

TUESDAY, Feb. 17, 1857.

DAVIS, ROBERT, Surgeon, 45 Prospect-pl., St. George's-rd., Southwark. Mar. 4, at 10; *Com. Murphy.*

DEISCOLL, MICHAEL, Theatrical Bill Poster, 6 Cockpit-yard, Little James-st., Bedford-row. Mar. 4, at 10; Com. Murphy.

ETHERINGTON, WILLIAM, Engineer, 8 Queen-st., Charles-st., Hackney-rd. Mar. 5, at 11; Com. Phillips.

HEDGES, GEORGE, Grocer, now out of business, 9 Hampton-ter., Hampstead. Mar. 4, at 11; C. Com. Law.

HUGHES, THOMAS CHARLES, now out of employ, 3 Holywell-pl., Fulham-rd., Chelsea (late of 16 Blomfield-st., Westbourne-ter. North, Paddington, Chelsea Decorator). Mar. 4, at 10; Com. Murphy.

MORGAN, JAMES, Assistant to an Innkeeper, George and Dragon, Farnborough, Kent (formerly of 9 Bartlett's-bldgs, Holborn, Tailor). Mar. 5, at 11; Com. Phillips.

POULTON, MARY ANN, Widow, General Shop-keeper, Leavesden-green, Watford, Herts. Mar. 4, at 11; C. Com. Law.

TMOTHEE, JOSEPHINE, Widow, Dressmaker and Milliner, 45 Great Windmill-st., Haymarket. Mar. 5, at 11; Com. Phillips.

WHITEHEAD, CHARLES, Merchant's Clerk, 4 Wakeling-ter., Barnsbury, Islington. Mar. 4, at 10; Com. Murphy.

PRISONERS' PETITIONS to be heard at the COURT HOUSE, PORTUGAL-STREET.

FRIDAY, Feb. 13, 1857.

CHESSUM, JOSEPH JOHN (Hearn & Chessum), (sued as Joseph John Chessum), Builders, 3 & 4 Lansdown-pl., Upper Norwood. Feb. 28, at 11; Com. Murphy.

DOWNES, RICHARD (sued as Robert Downes), Bedstead and Cornice Manufacturer, 2 Ewer-st., Union-st., Borough. Mar. 2, at 11; C. Com. Law.

GARLICK, JANE SHUCKBROUGH, Spinster, Tobaccoist, 20 Bouverie-st., Fleet-st. (formerly of 42 Great Queen-st., Lincoln's-inn-fields). Feb. 28, at 11; Com. Murphy.

GOODRICE, HENRY NEWTON, Shopman to Tobaccoist, 407 Oxford-st. Feb. 27, at 10; Com. Murphy.

HALE, HENRY, Plasterer, Beehive-yard, St. John's-wood-ter., St. John's-wood. Feb. 28, at 11; Com. Murphy.

HEARN, EDWIN LEVIE (sued as Edward Lewis Hearn), Grocer and Journeyman Carpenter, 2 Belvedere-rd., Upper Norwood, in copartnership with Joseph John Chessum, 4 Lansdown-pl., Upper Norwood. Feb. 28, at 11; Com. Murphy.

LAMPLUGH, HENRY, Chemist, 1 Mecklenburgh-ter., Gray's-inn-rd. Feb. 27, at 10; Com. Murphy.

RUTHERFORD, JAMES, Engineer, Wellington Iron Works, Haggerstone-wharf, Hackney-rd. Feb. 28, at 11; Com. Murphy.

WARREN, JOHN, Pianoforte Manufacturer, Crown Coffee-house, 14 Duke-st., London-bridge. Feb. 28, at 11; Com. Murphy.

WESTWORTH, CHARLES, out of business, 11 Beazeley's-crescent, Old Ford-rd. (late of 5 Gloucester-ter., Cambridge-rd., Bethnal-green, Attorney's Clerk). Feb. 27, at 11; Com. Murphy.

TUESDAY, Feb. 17.

HINSLEY, GEORGE HALKON (Hinsley & Bryant), (sued with Thomas Bryant), Builder and Bricklayer, Lower Norwood. Mar. 3, at 10; Com. Murphy.

SMITH, WILLIAM HENRY (Smith Brothers & Co.), out of business (formerly in copartnership with Thomas Smith & John Sunley, Advertising Agents, 29 Ironmonger-la.), 79 Charlwood-st., Fimlico. Mar. 4, at 11; C. Com. Law.

WOODWARD, RICHARD, Cabinet-maker, 12 Kirby-st., Hatton-garden. Mar. 3, at 10; Com. Murphy.

PETITIONS to be heard at the COUNTY COURTS.

TUESDAY, Feb. 17.

ALLEN, WILLIAM, Journeyman Filesmith, Court back of No. 122 Scotland-st., Sheffield. Mar. 4, at 12; Sheffield.

BROOKS, THOMAS, Shopkeeper, 1 Princes-st., Abergystwith. Feb. 28, at 2; Abergystwith.

BUSHELL, AMOS, Boot and Shoe Maker, Aldermaston-st., Aldermaston. Mar. 6, at 11; Reading.

CARR, JOSEPH, Cavvysser for Books and Periodicals, Bridge-gate, Rotherham, Yorkshire. Feb. 27, at 12; Rotherham.

COLLARD, HENRY, out of business, 28 Penn-st., Bristol (formerly Pork Butcher, 14 Horse-fair, Bristol). Mar. 18, at 10; Bristol.

DOTY, CHARLES (sued as Dawtry, Daughtry, Doughtry, and Doughtry), Metal Caster, Napier-st., Cemetery-rd., Sheffield. Mar. 4, at 12; Sheffield.

DOWE, JAMES, Plumber, Newnham, Cambridge. Feb. 23, at 10; Cambridge.

DURN, JAMES, Weaver, Water-lane, Norwich. Feb. 24, at 10; Norwich.

FARRAR, RICHARD, Cabinetmaker, 31½ North-st., Queen-st., Sheffield. Mar. 4, at 12; Sheffield.

GARDINER, HARRIETT, out of business, Limekiln-la. Bristol (formerly Saddler and Harness Maker, 115 Temple-st., Bristol). Mar. 4, at 10; Bristol.

LAYCOCK, GEORGE, Leather Cutter, 22 Nursery-st., Sheffield. Mar. 4, at 12; Sheffield.

PRINCE, JOSEPH, Rope Maker, Raglan, Monmouthshire. Mar. 9, at 12; Usk.

PRE, SAMUEL FRANCIS, in no business, Lakenham, Norwich, (previously of Cherry-st., Abergystwith, Grocer). Feb. 24, at 10; Norwich.

RODGERS, WILLIAM, Edge Tool Grinder, 27 Bramber-st., Brightside Bierlow, Sheffield. Mar. 4, at 12; Sheffield.

ROGERS, RICHARD, Journeyman Printer, also carrying on business of Licensed Victualler, Coach and Horses, Handbridge, Cheshire. Feb. 25, at 10; Chester.

SANDERSON, JOHN, Beerhouse Keeper and Fork Grinder, Number One Beerhouse, Silver-st. Head, Sheffield. Mar. 4, at 12; Sheffield.

WALFORD, WILLIAM, Miller, Alcester, Warwickshire. Feb. 27, at 11; Alcester.

WEAVERS, ROBERT, Journeyman Maltster, Heigham-st., Norwich. Feb. 24, at 10; Norwich.

FRIDAY, Feb. 20.

BIGGINS, THOMAS, Joiner, Barton, Farnham, Chester. Feb. 25, at 10; Chester.

CUNLIFFE, WILLIAM, Beer Retailer, Buckfield, Bacup, Rochdale, Lancashire. Mar. 5, at 12; Rochdale.

DICKINSON, WILLIAM, Higler and Pork Butcher, Colney-st., St. Albans. Feb. 25, at 10; St. Albans.

EDWARDS, JOHN, Labourer, Cwmsychan. Mar. 12, at 10; Pontypool.

EVANS, BENJAMIN, Collier, Foundry Town, Aberdare, Glamorgan. Mar. 12, at 10; Aberdare.

EVANS, DAVID, out of business, Aberaman (formerly of Maesteg, Bridgend, Glamorganshire, Grocer). Mar. 12, at 10; Aberdare.

GOON, JOHN, Beer Retailer, Bell Inn, 17 Clarence-st., Newport. Mar. 11, at 12; Newport.

HANSHEW, THOMAS AMBROSE, Boot and Shoe Maker, High-st., St. Alban's. Feb. 25, at 10; St. Alban's.

HARDY, JOHN, Confectioner, Red Lion-st., Nottingham. Mar. 10, at 10; Nottingham.

HARTLAND, JAMES, Grocer, Upper Falkner-st., Barton St. Mary, Gloucester. Mar. 18, at 10; Gloucester.

JACKSON, CORNELIUS, Grocer, Shutlanger, Stoke Bruern, Northamptonshire. Mar. 5, at ten; Towcester.

LILLY, JOHN, Butcher, Staley's-bldgs, Oldham-rd., Rochdale. Mar. 5, at 12; Rochdale.

MACKIE, SAMUEL JOSEPH, out of employment, 12 Hemus-ter., King's-rd., Chelsea (formerly of 2, East Cliff, Folkestone, Landing Waiter). Mar. 16, at 10; Folkestone.

MAGGS, STEPHEN, Butcher, Trevethin, Monmouth. Mar. 12, at 10; Pontypool.

MILNE, WILLIAM, Schoolmaster, New House, St. Alban's. Feb. 25, at 10; St. Alban's.

NORMAN, ROBERT, Auctioneer and Innkeeper, Dulverton, Somerset. Mar. 12, at 11; Tiverton.

PENN, GEORGE, Boot and Shoe Manufacturer, Royal Standard Beer-house, Nelson-st., Northampton. Mar. 4, at 11; Northampton.

RAGGETT, JAMES, Watchmaker, High-st., Hemel Hempstead. Feb. 25, at 10; St. Alban's.

STURBETT, ROBERT, Dealer in Timber, Fishpool, Blidworth, Nottingham. Mar. 9, at 12; Mansfield.

TOWLE, WILLIAM, Builder, Birch-row, New Radford, Nottingham. Mar. 10, at 10; Nottingham.

WILLIAMS, THOMAS, Coker, Hirwain, Penderin, Brecon. Mar. 12, at 10; Aberdare.

WORNES, GEORGE, Livery-stable Keeper, Cottle's-la., Walcot, Bath. Feb. 27, at 11; Bath.

PRISONERS' PETITIONS to be heard at the COUNTY COURTS.

FRIDAY, Feb. 13, 1857.

ASHCROFT, JEFFREY, Provision Dealer, Rusholme-road, Manchester. Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

BANKS, JOHN, Journeyman Tailor, Wire-st., Ashton-under-Lyne (formerly of Wellington Arms, Moseley Brow, Beerseller). Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

BARROW, ROBINSON, Manchester Salesman, 92 Lloyd-st., Greenheys. Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

BERRISFORD, JOSEPH, Brewer and Beer Retailer, Odd Fellows' Arms, 43 Ridgway-st., Manchester. Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

BERRY, GEORGE, Stonemason, Newport-st., Bolton-le-Moors. Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

BRADBURY, JOHN, Beerseller, Phoenix Arms, Murray-st., Oldham-rd., Manchester (formerly 286 Oldham-rd., Grocer). Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

BRADBURY, JOHN, out of business, Water Sheddings, Oldham (formerly of Morton-st., Oldham, Joiner). Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

BRINNES, RICHARD, out of business, Albert-pl., Oxford-st., Infirmary-rd., Sheffield (previously of St. Philip's Tavern, and 23 Netherthorpe, Sheffield, Butcher and Licensed Victualler). Mar. 4, at 12; Sheffield.

BROWN, JOHN, Farmer, Little Bolton, Eccles, Manchester. Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

BUCKLEY, SAMUEL, Provision Dealer, Park-parade, Ashton-under-Lyne. Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

BUTTERFIELD, HENRY, out of business, Barrowford, Colne, Lancashire (formerly of same place, Lozenge Manufacturer). Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

CAFFE, SAMUEL LOUIS, Assistant to an Outfitter, 68 Hope-pl., Liverpool (formerly of 87 Waterloo-rd., Liverpool, Billiard Merchant). Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

EGAN, THOMAS, Commercial Traveller, 77 Elizabeth-st., Waterloo-rd., Manchester (formerly of Ducie-bridge Mill, Manchester, Machine Maker). Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

GRIFFITHS, JOHN, Master of the Schooner Wellington, and Coal Dealer, New-st., Carnarvon. Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

HAYWOOD, SAMUEL, out of business, 61 Upper Medlock-st., Hulme, Manchester (formerly of 1 Adelphi-st., Salford, Timber Merchant). Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

HORNBY, GEORGE, Auctioneer, 80 Stephenson-st., North Shields, and 5 St. Nicholas's Church, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Feb. 27, at 10; Morpeth.

JONES, EDWARD (sued with Alice Hirst Latham), Bookkeeper, 11 Olive-grove, Chapman-st., Hulme, Manchester. Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

JONES, THOMAS, Bricklayer, 15 Nesbit-st., Hulme, Manchester (formerly of the New Inn, St. Asaph, Licensed Victualler). Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

KENTON, WILLIAM, Painter, Painters' Arms, 21 Union-st., Blackburn. Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

KIRBY, JAMES, out of business, 20 Radnor-st., Hulme, Manchester (formerly of 19 Bridge-st., Stockport, Linen and Woollen Draper). Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

LERESCHE, JOHN HENRY PROCTOR, Barrister-at-law, Hope Cottage, Cheetham, and 2 St. James-square, Manchester (formerly of Standish, Wigan, Coal Proprietor). Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

M'KENNA, LAURENCE, Labourer, Smith's-bldgs, Moss-view, Altrincham, Manchester. Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

NUTTALL, RICHARD, Common Carter, Fothergill, Blackburn. Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

ROGERS, JOHN (sued as John Rogers), Journeyman Confectioner, Morningside-st., Woodborough-rd., Nottingham (previously of Goose-gate, Nottingham, Baker). Mar. 10, at 10; Nottingham.

SCHOFIELD, JOHN, out of business, Mill-la., Ashton-under-Lyne (formerly of Chapel House, Astley-st., Duckfield, Licensed Victualler). Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

SHARPIES, JOHN, Hairdresser, 98 Fishergate, Preston. Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

SMETHURST, JAMES, jun., out of business, Valentine-row, Blackley, near Manchester (formerly of Barnes-green, Blackley, Grocer). Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

UNSWORTH, JOHN, out of business, Bank-st., Warrington (formerly of Horse Market-st., Warrington, Lancashire, Saddler). Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

VINT, JAMES, Grocer, Victoria-st., Ashton-under-Lyne. Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

WALSH, JOHN, Carver, 19 and 23 Cannon-st., Preston. Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

WOOD, AARON, Journeyman Cotton-spinner, Crickets-la., Ashton-under-Lyne. Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

WRIGHT, JAMES, Journeyman Painter, Mill-la., Newton-le-Willows (formerly of the Vulcan Foundry, Newton-le-Willows, Lancashire, Provision Shop-keeper). Feb. 27, at 11; Lancaster.

TUESDAY, Feb. 17, 1857.

BECK, JAMES, Dealer in Wines and Spirits (in name of T. H. Cooper), Willenhall, Staffordshire. Mar. 4, at 10; Stafford.

BROWN, WILLIAM, Tailor, Longton, Staffordshire. Mar. 4, at 10; Stafford.

COLLINS, JOSEPH, Licensed Victualler, Ivy House Inn, Cosely, near Sedgley, Staffordshire. Mar. 4, at 10; Stafford.

GIBSON, HENRY, Baker and Miner, Shelton, Staffordshire, near 10; Stafford.

KEY, JAMES, Farmer and Licensed Victualler, Eccleshall, Staffordshire. Mar. 4, at 10; Stafford.

MORGAN, RICHARD, Accountant, Wolverhampton. Mar. 4, at 10; Stafford.

OSBORN, WILLIAM, selling Agricultural Implements by Commission, St. Peter's Walk, Wolverhampton. Mar. 4, at 10; Stafford.

PARTIDGE, SAMUEL, Licensed Victualler and Farmer, Daw End, Rushall, Staffordshire. Mar. 4, at 10; Stafford.

THOMAS, MARY, Widow, Innkeeper, South Wales Inn, High-st., Swansea. Feb. 25, at 11; Swansea.

URWIN, JOHN, Publican, Old Duke of Cumberland Inn, 1 Hind-st. West, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Mar. 10, at 1; Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

WRIGHTMAN, EDWARD (sued as Edward Wightman), Publican, Old Queen's Head, 159 Pilgrim-st., Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Mar. 10, at 1; Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

MEETINGS.

FRIDAY, Feb. 13, 1857.

TAYLOR, ROBERT, Joiner and Builder, 15 Queen-st., Bishopwearmouth, Durham. At Mr. Brooke's Palatine Hotel, Bishop Wearmouth, on Mar. 2, at 4, to direct how, when, and where his real estate and reversionary interest shall be sold.

FRIDAY, Feb. 20.

BENNETT, JAMES, Wheelwright, Chapel St. Mary, Suffolk. At Wellington Inn, Cat-st., Ipswich, on Mar. 9, at 7 p.m., to direct how and where his real estate shall be sold.

BOOTH, WILLIAM, Teacher of Music, Hopwood-la., Halifax. Mar. 13, at 10; Halifax. *Dir.*

HORSFALL, RICHARD, jun., Stonemason, Hardhead-cum Clifton, Dewsbury, Yorkshire. Mar. 13, at 10; Halifax. *Dir.*

DIVIDENDS.

TUESDAY, Feb. 17, 1857.

At ASSIGNEES OFFICE, 5 Portugal-st., between 11 and 3.

BOLTON, GEORGE BOLTON, Attorney's Clerk, 95 Nicols-sq., Hackney-rd. 1s. 11d.

BURKE, JOHN SMITH, Railway Contractor, 4 Rye-hill, Peckham. 9d.

BURKINSHAW, GEORGE, out of business, 139 High Holborn. 6d.

CARUCCI, PAUL, out of business, 139 High Holborn. 6d.

DONNIN, WILLIAM, Retired Assistant Clerk in the Paymaster-General's Office, 129 Chancery-la. 10s. 11d.

FOSTER, GEORGE, Boot and Shoe Maker, Kneeton, near Bingham, Nottinghamshire. 9d.

FOULGER, JOHN, Tailor, 2 Wellington-ter., Liverpool-rd., Islington. 2s. 2d.

FRANCE, WILLIAM, Painter, Stockton-on-Tees, Durham. 2s. 6d.

FREEMAN, JOSEPH, Cow Keeper, 59 London-st., Tottenham-ct.-rd. 1s. 9d.

FRIED, THOMAS, Grocer, Southampton-st., Camberwell. 7d.

GIBSON, JOHN, Pensioner, Starwix, Cumberland. 6s. 11d.

JADIS, VANE, Clerk in the Colonial Office, 137 Sloane-st. 3s. 3d., making 9s. 7d.

KEELING, THOMAS, Bill Broker, Peckham Rye. 1s. 6d.

MOCKETT, WILLIAM FORD, Corn Dealer, 3 Manor-pl., King's-rd., Chelsea. 2s. 10d.

PATCH, WILLIAM OTTO, Superannuated Clerk, Council Office, Whitehall, Exmouth, Devonshire. 5s. 4d., making 15s. 3d.

POOL, HENRY, Journeyman Mason, Weston-super-mare, Somersetshire. 3s.

REDSHAW, ELIZABETH, Widow, 23 Frederick-st., Regent's-pk. 2s. 10d.

RICHARDSON, JAMES, Butcher, East-rd., Cambridge. 7d.

RIDING, ROBERT, Joiner, Church-st., Altrincham, Manchester. 5d.

ROOFF, FREDERICK WILLIAM, out of business, St. Mildred's, Canterbury. 4s. 7d.

SHURESF, MELVILLE, Retired Clerk in the Greenwich Old-Pension Office, 135 Albany-rd., Camberwell. 2s. 3d., making 3s. 6d.

STERMER, FREDERICK, Clerk, 50 Howland-st., Fitzroy-sq. 3s., making 7s.

WADDELL, ROBERT, Journeyman Cooper, 249 Tottenham-ct.-rd. 5s. 11d.

WIGGLESWORTH, WILLIAM, Hairdresser, 8 Peel-sq., Bradford, Yorkshire. 1s. 5d.

FRIDAY, Feb. 20.

BLAKE, WILLIAM, at County Court Office, Newport, any day between 10 and 4. 1s. 1d.

BUTCHER, JAMES, at County Court Office, Newport, any day between 10 and 4. 4d.

DANIEL, EDWIN, at County Court Office, Stone, any day after Mar. 1, between 10 and 4. 4d.

EDWARDS, JOHN, Surgeon, Dorchester, at G. Symonds' office, Dorchester. Final Div. 7s. 10d.

Assignments for Benefit of Creditors.

TUESDAY, Feb. 17, 1857.

DEECROFT, JOSEPH, Grocer, High-st., West Bromwich, Staffordshire. Jan. 27. *Trustee*, W. Harwood, Provision Dealer, Lee Bank-rd., Birmingham. *Sol.* James, Birmingham.

BLOXSON, WILLIAM, Machinist, Walton, Leicestershire. Feb. 5. *Trustee*, W. Butlin, Ironfounder, Northampton; W. Holloway, Auctioneer, Northampton. *Sols.* Andrews, Market Harboro'; and Dennis, Northampton.

BOND, JAMES, Grocer, Dowlais, Glamorganshire. Jan. 29. *Trustee*, T. Smerdon, Flour Merchant, Cornish, Llandaff; J. Shapton, Commission Agent, Merthyr Tydvil. *Sol.* Smith, Merthyr Tydvil.

BRIDGLAND, EDWARD, Carpenter, Sissinghurst, Kent. Jan. 31. *Trustee*, G. Crampson, Miller, Sissinghurst; C. Chantler, Farmer, Hockridge, *Sol.* Futar, Cranbrook, Kent.

DOWDING, GEORGE, Draper, 6 Commercial-pl., Caledonian-rd., Islington. Feb. 2. *Trustee*, D. Chapman, Warehouseman, Falcon-sq.; L. Bew, Warehouseman, Wood-st., Cheapside. *Sol.* Keighley, 20 Moorgate-st.

SMITH, THOMAS, Timber Merchant, Teignmouth, Devon. Jan. 19. *Trustee*, T. Brown, Merchant, Restarick, Devonport. *Sol.* Elworthy, 6 Courtenay-st., Plymouth.

STANWIX, ELIZABETH, Widow, Victualler, Warwick. Feb. 9. *Trustee*, W. Hues, Manager of the Warwick and Leamington Brewery, Warwick; W. Parrott, Manager of the Union Wharf Co., Warwick. *Sols.* Haynes & Moore, Warwick.

SWAN, THOMAS, & THOMAS REED REIKES SWAN (Swan & Son), Linen and Woollen Drapers, 139 Villiers-st., Sunderland. Jan. 29. *Trustee*, J. Waller, Linen and Woollen Draper, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. *Sol.* Hoyle, 30 Grey-st., Newcastle.

FRIDAY, Feb. 20, 1857.

DILKES, FREDERICK THOMAS, Shoe Manufacturer, Leicester. Feb. 13. *Trustee*, T. Mitchell, Cabinet Maker, Leicester; C. Spencer, Currier, Leicester. *Sol.* Stevenson, Leicester.

KIRKBY, JOSEPH, Builder and Cabinet Maker, Henlow, Bedfordshire. Feb. 4. *Trustee*, F. Brown, Ironmonger, Farley-rd., Luton; R. Brown, Timber Merchant, Stuart-st., Luton; E. O. Williams, Builder, Guildford-st., Luton. *Sol.* Bailey, Luton.]

Partnerships Dissolved.

TUESDAY, Feb. 17, 1857.

ARMSTRONG, RICHARD, & WILLIAM WATSON KNIGHT, General Merchants, 14 Mark-lane. Feb. 13.

JAMESON, JOHN BLAND, & JOSEPH JAMESON, Cotton Spinners, Heywood, Lancashire. Jan. 1.

CARPENTER, HANNAH, & SUSANNAH CARPENTER, Milliners, High-st., Warwick. Jan. 29.

COURTES, MANASSEH, & JOHN TAYLOR, Manufacturers, Coventry. Debts received and paid by Taylor. Feb. 14.

COWAN, ALEXANDER, & JOHN PENDER (John Pender & Co.), Merchants, Manchester and Glasgow. Dec. 31.

DOTHIE, JAMES, & JOSIAH SOUNDY, Tobacconists, Ipswich. Feb. 14.

DUNN, ALFRED, & GEORGE GARDNER, Mercers, Chichester. Debts received and paid by Dunn. Feb. 16.

FORNSTER, MARTIN, ISAAC HUNT, BENJAMIN BRIDGE, JOSEPH HUTSET, CHARLES BROWN, & JOHN LUSTY EVANS (East Vale Colliery Co.), Coalmasters, Weston Coyney, Longton, Staffordshire; as regards I. Hunt. Jan. 31.

GOMERSALL, JOSEPH, JOSEPH BERRY, & JOHN SCHOLEFIELD, Woollen and Worsted Spinners, Valley Mill, Heckmondwike, Yorkshire. Debts received and paid by Gomersall & Berry. Feb. 7.

GRAVIL, KITCHINGMAN, & ADAM MIDGLEY (Gravil, Midgley, & Co.), Grocers, Halifax. Debts received and paid by Gravil. Feb. 12.

HANSON, THOMAS, & JESSE HANSON, Farmers, Long Lee, Keighley, Yorkshire. Feb. 16.

HEIGHTON, EDWARD, & THOMAS LAWRENCE, Sword and Bayonet Manufacturers, Birmingham. Jan. 30.

HETHERINGTON, FLETCHER, & CROWN VAS, Commission Agents, 3 Old Fish-st. Debts received and paid by Hetherington. Feb. 13.

HOLGATE, JOHN, of Burton in Lonsdale, & MARY HOLGATE, Linen-draper, Bradford, Yorkshire (John & Mary Holgate). Debts received and paid by J. Holgate, jun., 67 Kirkgate, Bradford. Jan. 31.

HOWARD, DANIEL (deceased), CHARLES THOMAS, & MARY HOWARD (Howard & Thomas), Quilt Manufacturers, Edward-st., Oldham-rd., Manchester. Debts received and paid by Thomas. Dec. 31.

HOWARTH, GEORGE, & RICHARD HOWARTH (George Howarth & Son), Cotton Spinners, Bury, Lancashire. Debts received and paid by R. Howarth. Feb. 12.

HUGHES, HENRY, MARIA ISABELLA FLOCKTON, & HENRY BUNNING, Tar Manufacturers, Plough-bridge, Rotherhithe; as concerns H. Hughes. Dec. 31.

JOHNSON, EDWARD, & THOMAS HORSFALL, Cutriers, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Feb. 14.

JOHNSON, RICHARD WILLIAM, & THOMAS WILLIAM KENDER (Railway Carriage Co.), Oldbury, near Birmingham. Debts received and paid by Johnson. Jan. 31.

M'GREW, JAMES, & ALEXANDER M'GREW (James M'Grew & Co.), Grocers, Liverpool. Debts received and paid by A. M'Grew. Feb. 9.

RODGERS, JOHN, HENRY ATKIN, JOSEPH NESTROF, ROBERT NEWBOLD, GEORGE JOSEPH RODGERS, & JOSEPH RODGERS, jun. (Joseph Rodgers & Sons), Merchants, Silverthorns, and Manufacturers of Cutlery, Sheffield; as regards J. Rodgers and H. Atkin. Dec. 31, 1856.

SCHROEDER, HENRY SCHULDIAM, CHARLES GODDARD, & CHARLES MORTIMER (Schroeder, Goddard, & Co.), Russia Brokers, Old Broad-st.; as respects C. Goddard. Feb. 16.

SCOTT, JOHN ALDERSON, & EDWARD STOTLE CORNSWALL, Builders, 11 New Inn-yd., Shoreditch. Feb. 12.

STERRY, RICHARD, JOSEPH STERRY, HENRY STERRY, & ALFRED STERRY, Oil Merchants (Stery, Sterry, & Co.), 23 Cannon-st., and (Joseph Sterry & Sons) 156 High-st., Southwark; as regards A. Sterry. Feb. 12.

SUGDEN, SAMUEL, ROBERT BORRAS, JOHN EDENSON, & SAMUEL SUGDEN, jun. (Sugden, Borras, & Co.), Warehousemen, 12 Aldermanbury. Debts received and paid by S. Sugden. Dec. 31.

SYBRANDT, DARIUS, & ALEXANDER ALCOCK NEVINS, Cotton Merchants, New Orleans, in the United States of America. Debts received and paid by Sybrandt. Feb. 12.

TAYLOR, EDWARD, THOMAS ALLEN, & WILLIAM TAYLOR, Merchants, 84 Edmund-st., Birmingham; as regards T. Allen. Feb. 1.

TILLOTSON, THOMAS, Sheffield, & EDWARD MARSHALL, New York, in the United States of America, Merchants. Jan. 1.

WELCH, FREDERICK ISAAC, THOMAS WELCH, & WALTER WELCH (Welch & Sons), Tanners, Dean-st., Birmingham; as regards T. Welch. Feb. 12.
WINDER, ROBERT, JAMES WILKINSON, & THOMAS KNOWLES, Tanners, Great Bolton and Whittle-le-Woods, Lancashire; as respects R. Winder. Feb. 12.

FRIDAY, FEB. 20.

ABERCROMBIE, ROBERT, & JOHN MANLEY, General Practitioners in Medicine, West Bromwich, Staffordshire. Debts received and paid by Manley. Feb. 18.

BELL, JOHN, & GEORGE PRENTIS SHEPHERD, Chemists and Druggists, Guildford, Surrey. Feb. 14.

CHURCHWARD, JOHN, & FREDERICK WILLIAM FULTON, Spice Merchants, Stamford-house, South Lambeth. Debts received and paid by Fulton. Feb. 2.

CLARK, EDEN, & CHARLES SHORLAND, General Ironmongers, Manchester. Debts received and paid by Shorland. Jan. 3.

CLEVELAND, THOMAS BEERY, & WILLIAM PENN COX, Newspaper Proprietors and Printers, Leicester. Feb. 17.

COOKE, JAMES, & THOMAS PRIGG (Cooke & Co.), Paper Makers, Moorsley Bank Paper Mill, Durham. Debts received and paid by Cooke. Jan. 18.

CUNARD, JOSEPH, ALFRED BRETT, & ALGERNON S. AUSTEN, Insurance Brokers, London, Liverpool, & Southampton. Jan. 1.

DANSON, ELIZABETH, jun., ANNE DANSON, ELIZABETH KIDGER, & ANNIE KIDGER, Ribble Bank, Preston, Lancashire. Jan. 16.

DIBLEY, EDMUND, & HENRY JEWELL, Linen and Woollen Drapers, Dorking. Debts received and paid by Dibley. Aug. 1.

DOWSON, ROBERT, HENRY JERRISON, BENJAMIN CARTER, Stonemasons, Stockton, Durham. Feb. 2.

EVERETT, WILLIAM SMITH, & JAMES GOSLING EVERETT, Linen and Woollen Drapers, Winchester. Debts received and paid by W. S. Everett. Feb. 14.

FOWLER, FREDERICK JAMES, & WILLIAM HOWE (Fowler, Howe, & Co.), Manufacturers of Britannia Metal Goods, Love-st., Sheffield. Debts received and paid by Fowler. Feb. 14.

GILPIN, WILLIAM LAWRENCE, GEORGE FEATHERSTONE GRIFFIN, & JOHN ELPHINSTONE MILTON (London Anti-Oxide Paint Co.), New Bridge-st., Blackfriars. Feb. 14.

GREENING, TIMOTHY, & ROBERT COOK, Wire Drawers, Warrington, Lancashire. Debts received and paid by Cook. Feb. 13.

GRIFF, HENRY, WILLIAM GRIFF, & JOHN GRIFF (Grist & Sons), Flock Manufacturers, Merrett's Mills, & Rookmoor Mill, Stroud, Gloucestershire, & 22 Boar-lane, Leeds. Feb. 7.

HARMAN, ROBERT, & PURTON WESTON, Drapers and Grocers, Long Crenodon, Buckinghamshire. Debts received and paid by Harman. Feb. 18.

HAZELDINE, GEORGE, & THOMAS CHARLES MATTS, Coach Manufacturers and Contractors, Lant-st., Southwark. Debts received and paid by Hazeldine. Dec. 31.

KER, ROBERT, GEORGE SCHOFIELD, EDWARD DOERING, JOSEPH CHENEY BOLTON, GILBERT M'CKICKING, & WILLIAM KER, jun., and the firms of KER, DOERING, & Co.; and SCHOFIELD, DOERING, & Co.; at Batavia under firm of Pitcairn, Syme & Co.; at Singapore under firm of Syme & Co.; and at Manila under firm of Ker & Co. Dec. 31.

KIALMARK, GEORGE W. B., & THOMAS TRELOCK (Kiallmark & Co.), Cement Manufacturers, Dunball, Somersetshire. Jan. 1.

LOVIBOND, BENJAMIN, & WILLIAM GLYDE, Attorneys-at-Law, Weston-super-Mare, Somersetshire. Dec. 31.

MATHEWS, JOHN, & EDWARD KING, Salt Merchants, Pope's Cottages, King-st., Hammermith. Debts paid and received by Mathews. Feb. 16.

MERGATHROD, JAMES, & JAMES OLDFIELD, Woolstaplers, Halifax. Debts paid and received by Oldfield. Feb. 17.

MURPHY, GEORGE, & BENONI CROFT, Pianoforte Dealers, 195 Tottenham-st.-rd. Debts paid and received by Croft. Feb. 11.

PETROCCHIO, EUSTRATIO PANDIA, MARIUS CONSTANTINE CARALLI, ZANZI DEMETRIUS CARALLI, THEMISTOCLES PANTALEONE PETROCCHIO, & ALEXANDER PANDIA PETROCCHIO, Merchants, Malta and Constantinople, under firm of Petrocchio & Co.; Rio de Janeiro, under firm of T. Petrocchio & Co.; and in London, under firm of A. P. Petrocchio. Dec. 31.

PROCTER, ROBERT, & WALTON DRIVER, Cotton Manufacturers, King-st. Mill, Habergham Eaves, Burnley, Lancashire. Dec. 3.

ROBINS, WILLIAM LEWES TUGWELL, & JOHN HENRY COX (Robins & Co.), Portland Cement Manufacturers, Great Scotland-yd., Whitehall, and Northfleet, Kent. Debts paid and received by Robins. Dec. 31.

SALTER, GEORGE, & WILLIAM NOBBS, Boot & Shoe Salesmen, 19 London-st., Greenwich; 2 Douglas-st., Deptford; and 21 High-st., Newington. Feb. 14.

SHARPE, WILLIAM, & EDMUND SHARPE (Sharpe, Brothers, & Co.), Earthenware Manufacturers, Swadincote, Derbyshire. Debts paid and received by W. Sharpe. Feb. 18.

SIBLEY, JOHN, & THOMAS SIBLEY (Sibley & Son), Macinists, Ashton-under-Lyne. Feb. 16.

SPENCE, JAMES, & ALEXANDER MACALLISTER BUCHANAN, Silk Mercers, 77 and 78 St. Paul's-church-yd. Debts paid and received by Spence. Feb. 1.

WALTON, JOSEPH, JOHN WALTON, of Stanhope, JACOB WALTON, JONATHAN WALTON, & JOHN WALTON (Walton & Co.), Worsted Spinners, Alston, Cumberland. As respects John Walton, Alston. Feb. 7.

WILLIAMS, GEORGE LLOYD, & JAMES HENRY (Gordon & Co.), Insurance Brokers, 82 Mark-lane. Feb. 16.

WRIGHT, WILLIAM ARCHER, JAMES WRIGHT, & WILLIAM ARCHER WRIGHT, sen., since deceased, Farmers, Dummow Farm, Great Dummow, Essex. Feb. 11.

[Extract from Edinburgh Gazette, Feb. 17.]

THOMAS, ALEXANDER, DAVID HENDERSON, & ANDREW DEAS, Trustees and Executors of DAVID BROWN, Esq., Roseland Cottage, Linnithgow, have ceased to be partners of, or interested in the Western Bank of Scotland, Central Bank of Scotland, Linnithgow Coal Gas Light Company, Agriculturalist Cattle Insurance Company, United Kingdom Life Assurance Company, and the General Life and Fire Assurance Company.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

TUESDAY, FEB. 17, 1857.

CHOLMELEY, FRANCIS (who died in May, 1854), Esq., Brandsby-hall, Yorksh. Creditors and incumbrancers to come in and prove their debts and incumbrances on or before March 18, at V. C. Stuart's Chambers.

CHOLMELEY, HENRY PHILIP (who died in August, 1856), Esq., Brandsby-hall, Yorksh. Creditors and incumbrancers to come in and prove their debts and incumbrances on or before March 18, at V. C. Stuart's Chambers.

CLAPPERTON, JAMES (who died in April, 1835), Publican, Builders' Arms, Girdley-st., Poplar. Creditors to come in and prove their debts on or before March 26, at V. C. Kinderley's Chambers.

NORLE, GEORGE (who died in April, 1835), Builder, Woodford-bridge, Essex. Creditors to come in and prove their debts on or before March 2, at the Master of the Rolls' Chambers.

STEWART, JANE MARIA (who died in Sept., 1854), 23 Circus-rd., St. John's-wood. Creditors to come in and prove their claims on or before March 30, at V. C. Stuart's Chambers.

STEWART, JOHN (who died in April, 1853), Esq., 23 Circus-rd., St. John's-wood. Creditors to come in and prove their debts or claims on or before March 30, at V. C. Stuart's Chambers.

TURK, ELIZA (who died 11th June, 1856), Spinster, Alfred-house, Clapham. Incumbrancers to come in and prove their incumbrances on or before June 11, at V. C. Stuart's Chambers.

FRIDAY, FEB. 20, 1857.

ANSTEE, GEORGE (who died in Sept. 1826), Esq., Montagu-st. north, Russell-sq. Creditors to come in and prove their claims on or before Mar. 6, at V. C. Stuart's Chambers.

BROCKSOPP, THOMAS sen. (who died in Feb. 1855), Hosier, 12 Wood-st., Cheapside, and Nottingham. Creditors to come in and prove their debts on or before Mar. 18, at V. C. Stuart's Chambers.

ELLIS, JOHN (who died in Oct. 1856), Pulteney-st., Bath. Creditors to come in and prove their debts on or before Mar. 18, at Master of the Rolls' Chambers.

LINCOLN, JONATHAN ACKROYD (who died in Aug. 1854), Surgeon, Bradford, Yorkshire. Creditors to come in and prove their debts on or before April 3, at V. C. Stuart's Chambers.

LANGAN, CHARLES (who died in Dec. 1851), Publican, Liverpool. Creditors to come in and prove their debts on or before Mar. 20, Registrar's office, 1 North John-st., Liverpool.

DUMLOW, THOMAS BROWN (who died in May, 1851), Maltster and Farmer, Chellaston, Derbyshire. Creditors to come in and prove their debts on or before Mar. 21, at Master of the Rolls' Chambers.

RUSSELL, THOMAS (who died on Sept. 1, 1835), Esq., 40 Canonbury-sq., Middlesex. Creditors to come in and prove their debts on or before Mar. 18, at Master of the Rolls' Chambers.

WHITTINGSTALL, EDMUND FRANKLEY (who died in Mar. 1856), Esq., Banker, Langley Bury, Hertfordshire. Creditors and incumbrancers to come in and prove their debts or claims on or before Mar. 16, at Master of the Rolls' Chambers.

Winding-up of Joint Stock Companies.

TUESDAY, FEB. 17, 1857.

UNIVERSAL SALVAGE COMPANY.—Master Richards has peremptorily ordered a call of £5 7s. per share to be made on each contributory, to be paid (after debiting his account in the Company's books with such call) Mar. 3, at 11, at the offices of Mr. Ernest, 50 Cannon-st. CAMERON'S COALBROOK STEAM COAL AND SWANSEA AND LOUGHOR RAILWAY COMPANY.—Master Richards purposes, Feb. 23, at 1, to make a call of £2 per share upon all the contributories of the said Company settled upon the list up to this time.

METROPOLITAN CARBIDE COMPANY.—Master Humphry will proceed, on Mar. 3, at 11, to settle the remainder of the list of contributories of this Company; and, Mar. 4, at 11, to dispose of the claims of creditors in the said matter. Claims to be placed on the file of proceedings, and notice given to the Official Manager, four days at least prior to the day of such meeting.

GENERAL INDEMNITY INSURANCE COMPANY.—A petition for the dissolution and winding-up of this Company was presented, on Feb. 16, to the Lord Chancellor by Richard Woodbridge, Titchfield, Hants, Gent., which will be heard before V. C. Wood on Feb. 28. *J. & J. H. Linklater & Hackett*, Solicitors for the Petitioner, 17 Sile-lane.

FRIDAY, FEB. 20, 1857.

UNIVERSAL PROVIDENT LIFE ASSOCIATION.—The Master of the Rolls peremptorily orders a call of £1 10s. per share to be made on each contributory, and to be paid (after debiting his account in the books of the Association with such call) on March 2, at 11, to H. Croysdill, Official Manager, 84 Basinghall-st.

LANCASHIRE DEBT GUARANTEE COMPANY.—V. C. Stuart will proceed, on March 4, at 1, to settle the list of contributories.

SAINT DENNIS CONSOLS CHINA CLAY WORKS AND TIN MINE.—V. C. Wood, will proceed on March 12, at 12, to settle the list of contributories.

Scotch Sequestrations.

TUESDAY, FEB. 17, 1857.

CARMICHAEL, JAMES, Corn Merchant, Dundee. Feb. 21, at 12, British Hotel, Dundee. *See* Feb. 10.

CLUBB, JAMES, Painter, Findlay-st., Glasgow. Feb. 25, at 12, Faculty-hall, St. George's-pl., Glasgow. *See* Feb. 14.

CUNNINGHAM, JAMES, & JAMES MERVIN CUNNINGHAM, Grocer, Kilwinning. Feb. 20, at 12, King's Arms Inn, Irvine. *See* Feb. 12.

FORGAN, THOMAS RUSSELL, Farmer, Middlehouse, Carlisle. Feb. 21, at 12, Commercial Inn, Carlisle. *See* Feb. 10.

GREG, JAMES, Farmer, Fallside, Glenbervie, Kincardineshire. Feb. 19, at 2, Mill Inn, Stonehaven. *See* Feb. 9.

M'LEAN, NEIL, Dairyman, Clydebank, Govan. Feb. 24, at 12, Faculty-hall, St. George's-pl., Glasgow. *See* Feb. 13.

M'MAHON, HUGH, Clothier, Blairgowrie. Feb. 21, at 1, Procurator's Library, County Buildings, Perth. *See* Feb. 12.

FRIDAY, FEB. 20, 1857.

CAMPBELL, DONALD, Carter, Glasgow. Feb. 24, at 2, Faculty Hall, St. George's-pl., Glasgow. *See* Feb. 14.

CHREE, GEORGE, Malt Liquor Merchant, Glasgow. Mar. 2, at 12, Duck's Hotel, Argyle-st., Glasgow. *See* Feb. 18.

KERR, W. & T., Wrights and Builders, Glasgow. Feb. 26, at 2, Faculty Hall, St. George's-pl., Glasgow. *See* Feb. 16.

NICOL, JAMES, China, Glass, and Stoneware Merchant, 2 Ship-row, Aberdeen. Mar. 2, at 1, Lemon-tree Tavern, Aberdeen. *See* Feb. 17.

ROBE, JOHN, Painter, 27 Pitt-st., and 1 Summer's-pl., Edinburgh. Feb. 27, at 3, Stevenson's-rooms, St. Andrew-sq., Edinburgh. *See* Feb. 16.

STEWART, WILLIAM, Tacksman, Stronchormale, Argyll. Feb. 27, at 12, Argyll Arms Inn, Inverary. *See* Feb. 16.

S,

General

have had
15a. M.
anted.
of Sottie-
Abraham,
and Mr.
the latter
estimated
and their
irs of the
re vacan-
ting.
ified that
ar a most
ilar, and
y affects
raction of
nd to the
the con-
public.
irman.

s. d.

32 11 10

39 11 7

02 3 5

s. d.
98 7 7
18 18 7
42 0 10
33 16 2
46 5 0
94 16 10
28 3 2

02 4 10

54 13 0

tors.

greatly
d. The
well and

elected